Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-157
Wednesday
14 August 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-157

CONTENTS

14 August 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Paper Urges Consideration of Swedish Proposal *[IZVESTIYA 9 Aug]* 1
TASS Military Writer Urges Nuclear Test Ban 1
Physicist Makes Case for Keeping Nuclear Arms *[DEN No 12]* 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Liquidation Talks Reportedly 'Deadlocked' *[Prague Radio]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

'Studio 9' Program Hosts Dzasokhov, Zagladin *[Moscow TV]* 6
Petrovskiy Cited on UN Role, U.S. Relations *[TASS]* 12
Petrovskiy Receives ASEAN, PRC Delegations *[TASS]* 12
CSCE Committee Member Discusses Yugoslavia *[INTERFAX]* 12
PRAVDA Reports CSCE Meeting on Yugoslavia *[12 Aug]* 13
Shishlin Commentary on 'Agenda for the Future' *[PRAVDA 12 Aug]* 14

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

TASS Cites U.S. Statement on Arms Sales 17
Details of Planned Closure of U.S. Bases Abroad *[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]* 17
U.S. To Expand SE Asia Military Presence *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Aug]* 17
USSR Urged To Set National Interests, Goals *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Aug]* 18

China

Foreign Ministry Lauds Nonproliferation Decision *[INTERFAX]* 20
  Commentary Praises Decision *[Moscow International]* 20
Moscow Radio Comments on Kaifu's PRC Visit 21

Northeast Asia

Agreement With ROK Reportedly Prepared *[INTERFAX]* 21
South's Reaction to New DPRK Initiative Hailed *[PRAVDA 10 Aug]* 21
  Nuclear Weapons Removal Welcomed *[Moscow International]* 22
First Barter Trade Between DPRK, ROK Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 22

Southeast Asia

Commentary Views Normalized PRC-SRV Relations *[Moscow International]* 23
Pavlov Congratulates New SRV Premier *[Moscow Radio]* 23
Shenin Receives Departing SRV Ambassador *[PRAVDA 10 Aug]* 23
Commentary Views Improved Sino-Indonesian Ties *[Moscow International]* 23

Near East & South Asia

Kozyrev on Problem of POW's in Afghanistan *[Moscow TV]* 24
Border Violations by Afghan Air Force Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Aug]* 24

Paper on U.S. Plans for Further Strikes in Iraq *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Aug]* 25
Cooperation Memorandum Signed With Iran on Visas *[IZVESTIYA 10 Aug]* 26
Commentary Denounces Government-Backed Terrorism *[Moscow International]* 26
Gorbachev, Indian Leaders Exchange Congratulations *[PRAVDA 9 Aug]* 26
'Arafat Reaffirms Support for Peace Initiatives *[PRAVDA 14 Aug]* 27

West Europe

PRAVDA Views Soviet-Finnish Trade Prospects *[12 Aug]* 28
Finland Ready To Subsidize Ecological Action *[INTERFAX]* 28
BND Deputy on Kryuchkov's Information Offer *[PRAVDA 12 Aug]* 29
INTERFAX Assesses Collapse of Berlin Wall 29
UK To Help Establish Foreign Investment Bank *[TASS]* 29

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Pavlov Says Union Treaty To Change Economy *[INTERFAX]* 30
MOSCOW NEWS Publishes Text of Union Treaty *[TASS]* 30
Yanayev, Meskhetian Turks Discuss Homeland Return *[IZVESTIYA 10 Aug]* 30
'Islamic Factor' Conference To Be Held 22-26 Aug *[Moscow Radio]* 31
TASS Reports 'Result' of Vnukovo Pilots Strike 31
PRAVDA Commentary on Draft CPSU Program *[9 Aug]* 31
TASS Reviews 14 Aug Soviet Central Press 33

Economic

Pavlov on Cabinet Meeting, Economy, Food Supply *[Moscow Radio]* 34
  Says Famine 'Avoidable' *[Moscow TV]* 35
  Comments on Gasoline Price *[Moscow Russian TV]* 36
  Says Crisis Will Be 'Overcome' *[Moscow International]* 37
  PRAVDA Reports News Briefing *[14 Aug]* 37
  IZVESTIYA Reports News Briefing *[14 Aug]* 38
Yavlinskiy on Fate of 'Harvard' Reform Program *[Moscow Russian TV]* 39
Japan To Help Prevent Rise of Monopolies *[TASS]* 39
Gosbank Hikes Loan Interest From 8 to 12 Percent *[IZVESTIYA 30 Jul]* 40
Greater Thrift in Energy Consumption Urged *[PRAVDA 12 Aug]* 40
Importance of Western Technical Aid Highlighted *[IZVESTIYA 12 Aug]* 41
Further 3 Aug Cabinet Presidium Session Reportage *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Aug]* 42

Agriculture

Top Food Resource Official on Grain Procurement *[PRAVDA 9 Aug]* 45
Stavropol Oblast Raises Prices for Bread-Grain *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Commentary Views CPSU's Agrarian Policy *[IZVESTIYA 9 Aug]* 46

Scientific

'Stage-Two' Mir Station Plans Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Aug]* 48
Progress M-8 To Separate From Mir 15-16 Aug *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Space Center Extends Cosmonaut's Stay in Orbit *[TASS]* 49

Military

Yazov Denies START Destroys Strategic Balance *[INTERFAX]* 49
Yazov's Post May Go To RSFSR Representative *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 1 Aug]* 50
Students Threaten Strike Over Military Draft *[TASS]* 50
Senior Officers Urge End of Student Deferment *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Aug]* 51
MVD Units Hold Exercises at Nuclear Plant *[INTERFAX]* 52

BALTIC REPUBLICS

Estonia

- Ruutel Issues Statement on Baltic Independence *[BALTFAX]* 53
- Soviet, Estonian Prime Ministers Meet in Moscow *[BALTFAX]* 53
  - Savisaar Says Meeting 'Fruitful' *[BALTFAX]* 53
  - More on Meeting With Pavlov *[Tallinn Radio]* 53
- Meeting With Soviets Scheduled for 16 Aug *[INTERFAX]* 53
- Economic Agreement Discussions Set for 19 Aug *[BALTFAX]* 54
- Parliament Blocks Gorbachev Union Treaty Appeal *[Moscow TV]* 54
- Republic Government Endorses Job Contracts Law *[Tallinn Radio]* 54

Latvia

- Dimanis Expects 'Tension' To Rise in Republic *[TASS]* 54
- Baltic Military Staff Plan Exercises 15-25 Aug *[Riga Radio]* 54
- Republic Highways To Be Guarded by Armed Police *[BALTFAX]* 55
- Pro-USSR Deputies To Meet 17 Aug in Riga *[BALTFAX]* 55
- Riga Railway Station Customs Post Attacked *[Riga Radio]* 55
  - Further on Attack *[BALTFAX]* 55
- Republic Prisons To Be Guarded By Special Force *[BALTFAX]* 55

Lithuania

- Commission Issues Statement on Medininkai Attack *[Radio Vilnius]* 55
  - MVD Official Comments on Statement *[TASS]* 56
  - Further on Commission Statement *[INTERFAX]* 56
- Official Says OMON 'Hampering' Investigation *[Hamburg DPA]* 56
- Butkevicius Denies Saying Victim Named OMON *[TASS]* 57
- Republic Communists, OMON Urge Compromise *[PRAVDA 13 Aug]* 57
- Vilnius Black Berets Complain About Picketing *[Radio Vilnius]* 57
- PRAVDA Reports on Republic's Weapons Fund *[12 Aug]* 58
- Official Says Arms Stockpile for 'Self-Defense' *[TASS]* 58
- Lithuania, Armenia To Sign Cooperation Treaty *[BALTFAX]* 58
  - Further on Intergovernmental Treaty *[BALTFAX]* 58
- Republic Leaders Meet PRC Consular Officials *[Radio Vilnius]* 59
- More on Republic's Non-Violent Resistance Center *[BALTFAX]* 59
- Soldiers, Protesters Outside KGB Headquarters *[AFP]* 59

RSFSR

- Yeltsin Meets Communist Party First Secretary *[TASS]* 60
- Yeltsin Defends Decision To Sign Treaty *[Radio Rossii]* 60
- Yakut Supreme Soviet Nationalizes Union Property *[Radio Rossii]* 61
- North Ossetia Extends State of Emergency *[TASS]* 61
- Continuing Reportage on Departyization Decree 62
  - Gidaspov Comments *[PRAVDA 9 Aug]* 62
  - Leningrad Begins Implementation *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 10 Aug]* 62
- Party Hits Splittist Activity, Urges Consolidation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Aug]* 63
- Rutskoy Discusses Founding of New Party *[Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS 8 Aug]* 63
- Association of Self-Management Organs Set Up *[IZVESTIYA 3 Aug]* 65
- Russian Compatriots' Congress Opens 19 Aug *[INTERFAX]* 65
- Plan for Siberian Republic Causes Controversy *[TASS]* 65

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Belorussia

- Report Notes Scandal Over Business Deal *[Moscow Russian TV]* 67
- Manpower Shortage Cited for Agriculture Decline *[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]* 67
- Deputy Minister on Harvest Progress, Problems *[IZVESTIYA 10 Aug]* 67

Ukraine

Fokin: Famine Could Possibly Be 'Equal to' 1933 *[Moscow Russian TV]* 68
Collective Farm Chief Sends Telegram to Fokin *[Kiev Radio]* 68
Plyushch Views Republic Economic Policy *[Kiev International]* 68
Republic Cabinet Bans Exports of More Goods *[INTERFAX]* 68
Resolution on Foreign Travel Takes Effect *[Kiev International]* 69
New Independent TV Station in Republic Reported *[Moscow TV]* 69
Republic KGB Documents on Stalin Era Released *[TASS]* 69

Moldova

Leader Denies Gagauz Harboring 'Terrorists' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Aug]* 69
Law Establishing National Bank Comes Into Force *[TASS]* 70
Customs Posts Introduced To Protect Consumers *[PRAVDA 9 Aug]* 70

CAUCASUS

Georgia

Asatiani Discusses Ossetia, Ties with RSFSR *[INTERFAX]* 71
Statistics Indicate Continuing Economic Recession *[INTERFAX]* 71
    More on Republic's Economic Woes *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Agreement on Exchanges With Tatarstan Signed *[INTERFAX]* 71

Armenia

Premier on Possible Post-Referendum Developments *[Yerevan Radio]* 71
    TASS Reports Manukyan's Comments 72
    Further on Interrepublic Contacts *[INTERFAX]* 72
Manukyan Announces Candidacy for President *[INTERFAX]* 72
Republic Communists Back Talks on Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 72
Republic's Communist Party Formally Registered *[INTERFAX]* 73
Internal Ministry Troops Captured in NKAO Town *[TASS]* 73

Azerbaijan

President Mutalibov To Visit Iran 'This Week' *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Baku Muslims' Meeting on Prospects for Religion *[TASS]* 73

CENTRAL ASIA

Kyrgyzstan

Republic Expands Foreign Economic Activity *[TASS]* 75

Turkmenistan

Niyazov Says Republic Will Sign Union Treaty *[TASS]* 75

Uzbekistan

Central Asian Leaders Meet in Tashkent 13 Aug *[TASS]* 75
    Further on Tashkent Meetingt *[INTERFAX]* 75

Paper Urges Consideration of Swedish Proposal

PM1208153991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Aug 91 Union Edition p 5

[Correspondent M. Zubko report: "Key to Nuclear Disarmament. Swedish Government's Military Initiative"]

[Text] Stockholm—During the days of universal expectation preceding the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, an important proposal by Stockholm somehow was not particularly noticed. It was advanced a few days before the talks began in Moscow by Ambassador Maj-Britt Theorin, Sweden's representative on the Geneva Disarmament Committee: With the ending of the "cold war" the time has finally come to conclude a treaty on the total prohibition of all nuclear weapons tests.

Perhaps the Swedes wished to "enrich" the meeting between the USSR and U.S. presidents with their initiative, but the preparations for such a complex and important step, it has to be thought, were already moving according to a previously agreed-upon plan which was difficult to change, and the entire "other world" had already tuned into the Moscow wavelength. I do not know, perhaps the Swedish proposal was discussed in some way in Moscow, but I personally did not find any mention of it in the official reports.

Meanwhile, the initiative is of special significance and can give a powerful boost to those accords reached at the Soviet-U.S. talks.

Yes, the concluded Strategic Offensive Arms Reduction Treaty is of great significance. But the question arises: If the USSR and the United States, while eliminating some of their intercontinental missiles, themselves produce new and more sophisticated types of weapons (or other members of the nuclear club do so), will this be in line with the spirit of the concluded treaty? Such a thing could happen.

This is why Sweden's initiative ought to be examined most carefully. It is clear to everyone—and Maj-Britt Theorin particularly emphasized this—that reliable strike systems cannot be produced without test explosions, and this will sharply reduce their significance. The development of nuclear weapons will largely become pointless. It was no coincidence that the ambassador called the test ban "the key to nuclear disarmament."

It is known that there has recently been a fall in the number of tests in the world. This is reassuring. Eighteen were recorded in 1990—the smallest number for 30 years. But explosions were carried out nonetheless: eight by the United States, six by France, two by China, and one each by the USSR and Britain. These tests mean that new missiles were being produced somewhere in military plants.

There is no denying that it is a complex problem. For years the Soviet Union has been advancing proposals to abandon testing and has repeatedly imposed a unilateral moratorium on the carrying out of explosions, but not everyone has yet been inclined to support it.

The question of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons was touched on at the news conference which the USSR and U.S. presidents held in Moscow. I will remind you: M.S. Gorbachev, in particular, described as absurd the situation whereby "some will travel the path of disarmament, the path to a nuclear-free world, while at the some time others will find ways to possess their own nuclear weapons."

Of course, there are nuances here, but a nuclear test ban, one would think, would also help to resolve the question of nuclear nonproliferation. It is common knowledge that there are now at least several states in the world that are thought to be on the threshold of joining the nuclear club.

"For 30 years, the world's public has been demanding an end to nuclear weapon tests," Maj-Britt Theorin said at a session of the Disarmament Conference. "The total changes in world politics, the breakthrough in the matter of reaching accords in the sphere of nuclear arms reduction, and the decrease in the number of test explosions carried out attest that the time has come to conclude an agreement banning all kinds of nuclear explosions..."

Now that the USSR and the United States have signed the Strategic Offensive Arms Reduction Treaty, this is the very time to take note of the Swedish initiative, which could build a bridge to important new agreements.

TASS Military Writer Urges Nuclear Test Ban

LD1308092291 Moscow TASS in English 0746 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow August 13 TASS—Chinese Premier Li Peng declared in Beijing on Sunday that China is in principle ready to accede to the international nuclear non-proliferation treaty. The French Government took the "decision in principle" to join the treaty last June.

So all five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council will soon become parties to the international document.

Considering that South Africa, which is believed to have the technical capability to develop nuclear weapons, plans to join in as well, this year may see a dramatic increase in the effectiveness of the treaty, designed to prevent the spread of nuclear arms and thereby reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear catastrophe.

According to the latest data, 141 states are now officially parties to the 1968 treaty.

It binds nuclear weapons nations not to pass these armaments to anyone and those not possessing such arms, not to produce or acquire them.

Some critics contend that the treaty perpetuates the monopoly of major powers on nuclear weapons to the detriment of the security of non-nuclear countries. They argue that the treaty enables nuclear powers to keep what they already have, while denying to others what they do not have.

Formally, this reasoning is not devoid of logic. It would indeed be best of all to maintain equality among countries through an agreement on the immediate abolition of all nuclear weapons stocks. Regrettably, however, some nuclear powers are not yet prepared for such a solution, at least in the foreseeable future.

What should best be done in these conditions? Are there any acceptable alternatives to the non-proliferation treaty? There are obviously none.

The proliferation of nuclear weapons in violation of the treaty's letter and spirit and the entry of more countries into the "nuclear club" will pose the gravest security threat to all nations without exception.

Enhancing the nuclear weapons non-proliferation regime in every way is a most important guarantee of preserving peace and stability on the planet.

It should not be forgotten either that the nuclear powers under the treaty undertake to work towards an end to the arms race and towards nuclear disarmament as quickly as possible.

Experts argue with good reason that the shortest way to a stronger non-proliferation regime is through a complete cessation of nuclear weapons testing.

Physicist Makes Case for Keeping Nuclear Arms

91WC0146A Moscow DEN in Russian No 12, Jun 91 pp 1-2

[Interview with V.Z. Nechay, doctor of physical and mathematical sciences, professor, Lenin and State prize laureate, and director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Technical Physics, by A. Khokhlov; place and date not given: "Half-Life"]

[Text] **This is what our science is now going through, oriented as it is on solving the problem of the state's defense capability. The reasons this is happening have been considered by someone who until quite recently was one of the "secret" people: V.Z. Nechay, doctor of physical and mathematical sciences, professor, Lenin and State prize laureate, and director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Technical Physics, giving his first interview to the press.**

[Khokhlov] Vladimir Zinovyevich: For 32 years you have been engaged in the development and creation of nuclear weapons. Tell us, do we need them now that world politics have started to be built not on strength but on the principles of good-neighborliness and peace initiatives?

[Nechay] Is this what you think? Politics have always been unpredictable. Just think, who would have thought five or 10 years ago that the world's largest power would be sending tens and hundreds of thousands of its soldiers to restore "justice" on the other side of the world from its own borders.

[Khokhlov] You are talking about the Iraq-Kuwait conflict?

[Nechay] Yes. And also about the military actions of the U.S. Army close to the southern borders of the USSR. Perhaps this was the begining of a new division of spheres of influence in the world—focusing on the struggle for raw materials, which the world's technological-industrial elite must have to survive in this day and age. In our country it is as if they have already stopped taking this into account in the process of establishing the new "world order," and this is a very alarming symptom. Whether we like it or not, nothing has changed in the world: Only strength is respected. Any weakening of the country's military potential will inevitably entail an economic decline and setbacks in science and industry.

[Khokhlov] So is mankind doomed to an arms race? Nuclear weapons are weapons of mass destruction....

[Nechay] This is a 30-year-old delusion. Yes, they could be used for such purposes. But the machine gun is also a weapon of mass destruction. An ordinary knife can be considered in the same way if it is in the hands of a maniac. In fact, nuclear weapons are designed primarily to destroy military installations.

The Americans realized this before we did, and for quite some some they have regarded nuclear weapons exactly in this way. American scientists understood before we did that the race for superyields—50 megatons, 100 megatons, and so on—was absolutely unjustified. In fact, why do we need superbombs? What we need today is low-yield but highly accurate weapons. If a war suddently were to begin, there would be no need to destroy New York or Moscow. Strikes would primarily target launch silos, military bases, and command posts. It is one side's destruction of the other side's military potential that will bring victory in an armed struggle between two equal enemies.

[Khokhlov] Fine, but what do you have to say about the environmental contamination that would result from the explosion of a nuclear bomb? What is the use of victory in war if life on earth is no longer possible?

[Nechay] If all the nuclear weapons available to the USSR and the United States were exploded, then, in fact, the consequences for mankind would be horrible. If there were only a few hundreds of explosions (you can check the facts; this is not the cynicism of a "hawk" from the military-industrial complex but a strictly scientific calculation), nothing particularly horrible would occur. We should not forget that tests have already been conducted in the atmosphere. The contamination then was dozens of times less than what we had at Chernobyl and almost all of it went up into the stratosphere.

I believe that our half-baked environmentalists have done more harm to the people's health than all the nuclear tests conducted in the country. Today a frightened and duped people are suffering from fear. Instead of receiving medicine in the form of well-considered scientific information, they are being fed new "horrors." This is pure politicking. Incidentally, the Americans very harshly evicted the leader of the Kazakhstan "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" environmental movement, Olzhas Suleymanov, from Nevada. They are surprising people, these Americans: In Nevada they are proud of the fact that it is in their state that the nuclear tests that enable the United States to remain a superpower are conducted. Or are we the ones who are surprising?

[Khokhlov] The Americans are talking a great deal about the "new thinking," are they not?

[Nechay] In my opinion, they mean something very specific by this: what kinds of unilateral concessions the USSR will make. And they welcome this.

[Khokhlov] I have only a very poor idea of the psychology of our leaders, first and foremost the president. Let me remind you of the first year of perestroyka: Gorbachev announced that we would never make military concessions. Eighteen months later he made a 180-degree turn: Total capitulation to American interests. If I may be so bold, all of M. Gorbachev's political successes in the international arena have been achieved by one-sided concessions. To whom? To the United States, to Great Britain, and to Germany. We might justify this by saying: Yes, we do not need so many weapons, yes, we could have dozens of times less and would still be someone to be reckoned with.

[Nechay] But they will stop thinking that way as soon as the parity in nuclear weapons disappears.

[Khokhlov] Is it possible to debate the need for an arms race when the country is in crisis? What are more necessary now—missiles or potatoes?

[Nechay] Only a fraction of one percent of budget resources is being spent on scientific work and nuclear weapons testing. But how much is being spent on agriculture? "Linking" a potato shortage with nuclear bomb production is inconceivable. If the people lack something, it is not the nuclear people's fault. The causes lie entirely elsewhere. But it is very convenient for some people to form a new image of the enemy. So now they are creating it out of the defense industry, the military-industrial complex. In fact, at all levels here there is an inability to organize the work. Moreover, today the only advanced sector—ours—is being destroyed.

[Khokhlov] Are you referring to conversion in "defense"?

[Nechay] Conversion is necessary. We ourselves have recognized that it is impossible to restrict ourselves only to military research. We must look further afield. This provides, incidentally, a chance to make technical breakthroughs also in the main sphere of activity—weapons.

But conversion in the country has been started in quite an absurd way. First it was simply "recommended" that we convert 10 percent of the institute's potential, with a steady increase to 20 percent by the year 2000. But in two-and-a-half years we have reached 40 percent conversion activity.... It is a good thing that the scientific potential of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Technical Physics is great enough for us to have managed up to now to maintain a high level of efficiency in research and development in the weapons sphere. The main difficulty is what we set for ourselves.

[Khokhlov] Going no one knows where and doing no one knows what?

[Nechay] We did not even discuss it. We ourselves believed that if something had to be done, it was necessary to take action on the global scale. We engaged in the development of fiber optics systems, the development and production of computerized X-ray tomography, the manufacture of ultradispersed diamonds [ultradispersnyye almazy] with unique properties, developing a metalworking base for work with highly ductile materials, and many other questions that require a high level of scientific and technical potential and the ability to work to resolve. All of these things are the very latest technologies.

It is possible to route dozens of cable television programs, stereophonic radio broadcasts, and telephone lines through a single strand of a fiberglass cable. By the end of 1992, factories will be engaged in series production of many tens of thousands of kilometers of first-class fiberglass cables. But... Instead of the R60 million we asked for, the Cabinet of Ministers has allocated only R10 million, even though this is a state program.

It is the same with the development of computerized X-ray tomography. We buy this equipment in the West, paying more than $1 million for each unit. In late June, our all-Union scientific research institute was assembling a Soviet-built unit at a cost of R1.5 million, in last year's prices. The medical people need it, but they are poor. What about the government? Or is it more profitable to buy them from the West using hard currency?

The position with regard to the diamonds is the same, with universal metalworking rolling mills still using the so-called "potter's wheel" technology. This makes continuous metalworking possible. In the West it is still being mastered only empirically, but already has been included on the Cocom "black list:" Do not give it to the Russians...! But we have made this development based on the institute's scientific achievement. No one believes that we could do this in a Soviet Union wracked by crisis. Unfortunately, our leadership also does not believe it. So, no matter where we "turn," no one is as advanced as we are in the development. To make up for this, in five or 10 years we will again be unanimously admired by the Americans or Japanese.

[Khokhlov] Why is this happening?

[Nechay] It seems to me that the country's leadership is now more interested in words than deeds. Many government decisions are totally devoid of healthy common sense.

World experience shows convincingly that during its initial stage, conversion requires significant financial outlays. Here we are trying to do it by removing from the "defense people" what they had previously. Funding has simply been cut off. But, pardon me, people must be paid. Here, a search for the trivial has started, something that can be put in motion without particular effort. Highly skilled associates are starting to do trivial work. Specialized plants are being converted to the production of saucepans. This is the degradation of a leading sector.

Valentin Pavlov evidently does not think of the return that "defense" may generate in five years, as his task is to rob the enterprises now to somehow bring expenditure into line with earnings. He does not give a damn for anything else.

Today, a crime is being committed: The country's scientific potential is being destroyed.

[Khokhlov] According to your predictions, for how long will it be possible to sustain science with this kind of attitude toward it?

[Nechay] The degradation of our scientific sector has already begun and has been quite precipitous since 1985, when a unilateral moratorium was announced on nuclear testing. When that moratorium was announced we were not asked what we, the scientists, would lose, what the country would lose. It was believed that the party general secretary understood this better than we did....

The trouble lies not only in the government cutting off our funding. The nuclear workers and weapon makers have been operating for a long time on minimum funds and have still been able to maintain nuclear missile parity with America. The trouble is that we are not able to work and do research normally.

Here we should not forget that we are also discussing the country's security. If we want to guarantee the security of our people and of all mankind, we simply must show concern to strengthen the state's defense capability. Today, the main guarantee of security in the world is nuclear weapons. Reagan and Thatcher understood this. Bush understands it, as do the leaders of France and China. So nuclear testing and weapons improvement continue in the world. Last year, 1990, the United States conducted nine tests, France conducted five, China two. It was only we who "eliminated ourselves" by allowing other countries to make a technological breakthrough to develop a new generation of weapons. Thus, the hands of the aggressor who may impose his diktat on the world, us included, by the threat of the use of those weapons have been untied.

[Khokhlov] Is it still possible to halt the "half-life" of science and the degradation of the defense industry?

[Nechay] It is. It is still possible. What is needed is to conduct at least a minimum number of tests. The compensation for their inadequacy can be the powerful development of an experimental base.

[Khokhlov] They are now saying that the military-industrial complex is the main brake on the road of perestroyka and democratization. Is this true, are you "applying the brake"?

[Nechay] It is only on us that the brakes are "being applied." But when this is done, it is forgotten that this also applies the brakes to the rest of the country. Behind the vacant talk about politics, many people are now forgetting that only the scientific and technical revolution can move us along the path of progress. Unfortunately, minds are now occupied with something quite different. If this goes on, we will lose what we have.

Are we, then, crossing a dangerous line? Perhaps we should stay where we are and consider it for a while.

CEMA Liquidation Talks Reportedly 'Deadlocked'

LD0308102991 Prague Ceskoslovenska Rozhlas Radio Network in Slovak 1300 GMT 2 Aug 91

[Text] Soviet Union: The second round of the liquidation commission, which discussed the distribution of CEMA assets in Moscow, has not achieved any substantial rapprochement among the varying positions and has practically become deadlocked. In an interview with CTK's Moscow correspondent, the Czechoslovak representative Hugo Kysielka pointed out that the Soviet Union continues to insist on buying out CEMA assets for 50 million rubles. Other states, including Czechoslovakia, have demanded that the assets serve their original purpose, going to various trade and economic organizations. In their view the value should be $200-500 million.

'Studio 9' Program Hosts Dzasokhov, Zagladin

PM1308131591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1540 GMT 10 Aug 91

["Studio Nine" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin with A.S. Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, and V.V. Zagladin, USSR presidential adviser]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. As usual, we're meeting again at the Ostankino TV Center's Studio Nine to discuss important topical questions of international politics. Well, there is no doubt that the most important and significant event in the world of late has been the Soviet-U.S. summit. The press stopping reports from news agencies and correspondents in Moscow are now being replaced by a period of in-depth analysis and analytical articles whose authors are trying to work out just what has happened and how important it was. I think that we, too, will be trying to make such an analysis today. It is all the more important because it has to be said that the commentaries have been ambiguous. Most of the comment has been positive, making a very high assessment of the results of the Moscow summit. But you can also find negative statements in the international press. I want to start our discussion today with a question which I will ask both guests. First, though, let me introduce them. Our guests today are Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and USSR presidential adviser Professor Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin. I would like to ask both of you the same question—what was particularly important about the Moscow summit, and how did it differ from all previous summits? Let's start with you, Aleksandr Sergeyevich.

[Dzasokhov] It is very true that people's memories are short, but I think that this concept is hardly applicable to the subject we are discussing today. If we analyze it, we're talking about major and serious periods in Soviet-U.S. relations. First and foremost, we need to remember and, if you like, relive the atmosphere in which all we lived five or—even more so—10 years ago. The detente of the seventies found itself yet again subservient to ideological dogma. Our two states—two great powers—were again testing each other's strength in terms of the scale of the arms race. I recall that, back at the beginning of his presidency, President Reagan even said that we should be consigned to the ash heap of history. Times have changed—and a good thing too. I think that we should highlight the novelty and importance of a subjective factor—the purposeful and strong willed policies that have recently been typical of representatives of both our states. What is new about the situation is not just that disarmament processes are really thorough, but that we are now essentially moving from the regulation of disarmament issues to collaboration in this sphere. This is a fundamentally new situation. Regards the results, I would like our meeting here today to be free of any euphoria, because we still have a very long road ahead of us. I'd like to look at what we were unable to achieve during the talks. Certain problems were not raised at all and others cannot be considered a result of the talks. So what did we fail to achieve? Well, we didn't conclude an agreement on all-encompassing, comprehensive cuts in all kinds of weapons—including particularly dangerous weapons like nuclear arms. Some very controversial comments have been made. I'd like to say that the result of the two presidents' work is not some kind of condominium, much less a military-political alliance. That's not what it is, and there's never been any question of that. Nonetheless, both in the press and from various rostrums there have been assessments which are linked with the question you asked me. I'll just deal with this for a moment. First of all, Soviet citizens should know—and our press should deal with this matter appropriately—that people over there in America, in Washington, are currently rebuking the U.S. President for allegedly betraying U.S. national interests. Moreover, the opinion has recently been expressed that there is a real opportunity to move to a unipolar world centered on the United States—and that Bush is going to miss this opportunity. There have been many such comments. We too have a similar feeling in our public opinion. I am not sure it's the majority, but we need to look at the motivation behind such comments in our country. It is a very interesting point, and maybe we will come back to it in the course of this discussion. Because what is important here is not pigeonholing people but ensuring that there is a powerful, organized position. The genesis of these opinions is quite varied—on the one hand, there is not enough information about specific military-political issues, while on the other, certain people are not averse to exploiting this shortcoming in the interests of political gamesmanship.

[Zorin] Vadim Valentinovich?

[Zagladin] I'd frame the question slightly differently, while continuing what Aleksandr Sergeyevich said. Some time ago, approximately a year or two after perestroyka began, when our leadership and president were shaping the foundations of our foreign policy, they put forward a number of general proposals and called on the world to think about them and join in them. One of these was that security, above all, should be safeguarded by political rather than military means. Another was that we should all accept that peace is indivisible and that the security of each individual should be ensured by equal security for someone else. Another point was that the world is interdependent and, therefore, everything that occurs at each stage of the struggle for security has an instant impact on all other stages. The final point was that we are all members of the same civilization and should therefore collaborate to make sure that this civilization survives and develops. These were the general and somewhat philosophical, approaches. They didn't meet with understanding and support right away—particularly from the ruling circles in the United States and other countries. But let's look at the Moscow summit results from the standpoint of these four principles. First, let's go back to 1985—the first of the 11 meetings between our country's leader and the two U.S. Presidents. There was obviously a psychological breakthrough back then. For the first time, both sides recognized and enshrined in the communique—even though it was highly difficult at the time—the impossibility of nuclear war and the need to do everything necessary to avert it. That was a psychological breakthrough. Now we're seeing 40 percent cuts—physical cuts—in the most terrible strategic nuclear arsenals. This is a material breakthrough which confirms that by using political methods and talks—and these talks lasted almost 10 years—we can and must increase security and reduce the risk of a nuclear catastrophe. One of the next meetings, in 1987, saw the signing in Washington of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. At the time we said that we were starting to move from enmity to reflection and from confrontation to partnership. Today we can say that this partnership is already starting to operate, and this does not apply only to nuclear weapons. I would like to recall some documents that even our press overlooked for some reason—the three Soviet-U.S. statements on the Near East, Yugoslavia, and Central America. The two great powers agreed not to intervene or throw their weight around in these areas but to ensure peace for the peoples living there. What is that, if not real partnership and real proof of how right both sides have been to recognize the principle of indivisible peace? The third element is that our political dialogue in the sphere of disarmament and local conflicts up to now has been clearly outrunning our economic relationship. America's share of our trade turnover and our share of America's has fluctuated between 0.5 and 1 percent. For the first time, a major step has been taken toward raising economic relations to a level commensurate with political relations. Of course, this will take some effort, ut the steps that have been taken—it has now been agreed to grant our country Most Favored Nation status, and ratification of a trade agreement is in the works—are real steps which show that both sides have recognized the need for their ties and are thereby reaffirming the principle of interdependence.

[Zorin] I'm struck by a certain difference in the tone of our guests' assessments. Aleksandr Sergeyevich has—not without reason, in my view—drawn attention to what hasn't been achieved. Vadim Valentinovich has summed up the successes. In this connection, I'd like...

[Zagladin] We've already talked about what hasn't been achieved.

[Zorin] Right. That's why, Aleksandr Sergeyevich, I'd like to summarize as follows. Whatever aspect you look at, there's no doubt that a positive event has taken place. Nonetheless, there's been quite a bit of criticism, quite a bit of concealed and sometimes unconcealed dissatisfaction. Why is that?

[Dzasokhov] Well, it is very important for such criticism to always be sincere. That makes it easier to understand. In this connection I'd like to recap some of the points of departure in the Soviet-U.S. talks on strategic offensive arms [START]. This will help clarify your question. It was eight and a half years ago when, just as things were getting started, Washington, as is well known, began the SDI program. We were essentially faced with the condition—and sometimes the tone tended toward a demand—that we should abandon the ABM Treaty, which even now is very necessary. The atmosphere at the talks has changed and is now bull of trust. Now we can talk about the tasks the Americans set for themselves and were unable to achieve, in order to respond to those who were showing a profound interest in the content of the talks, so to speak. First, the Americans linked this with the SDI program. They didn't achieve this goal, because we made the two issues separate. The documents signed by our two heads of state contain a very clear and separate section which states that, in the event of a particular threat to their national interests, the sides are entitled to withdraw from these treaty systems. That is, we covered our backs, so to speak, because we are in an ongoing process [my nakhodimsya v puti]. The second point was that our partners set themselves the goal of ruling out any discussion of nuclear-capable aircraft and sought to limit themselves to the question of ballistic missiles. They backed off of that position as a result of the talks and consequently failed to achieve their goal—although it was wrong from the outset, in my view. The documents which have now been signed make provision for regulating, albeit incompletely, the entire system of heavy bombers. It has now become known, following the Bush visit here, that the previously requested 132 B-2 bombers—commonly called stealth bombers—have been cut back to 75. That is, the response we agreed to is already being implemented. The next point is that they set themselves the task of ruling out any discussion of cruise missiles. The result was obvious—we just said it wouldn't wash. Now look at what we have agreed to. I would say that this would interest both viewers and political scientists. A total of 1,500 ballistic missiles and bombers will be cut under the treaty. They had been meant to deliver 8,000 warheads. Each of today's nuclear warheads is 10-15 times more powerful than the still-terrifying bomb that fell on Hiroshima. That's what has been happening, and it is very important.

[Zorin] Eighty thousand Hiroshimas?

[Dzasokhov] That's the whole point—80,000 Hiroshimas. And now, in implementing the treaty, we will be destroying in the space of seven years some 30 percent, and in material terms—you are right, Vadim Valentinovich—approximately 42 percent, of our warheads. But the treaty lasts for 15 years, so this means that for 15 years there will be strategic parity. It's very important to take all this into account. People may now say that we made concessions—of course we did. After all, you don't negotiate on the basis that there will not be any compromise. That's a prerequisite. Otherwise you wouldn't have talks, you'd have one side dictating its conditions. So what I want to say is: Yes, we too failed to achieve a few things. For instance, the inclusion of sea-launched missiles in the talks is an issue for the future. We also failed to separate out the SDI issue—we had wanted to dispense with that concept altogether—and to agree some questions of principle. So we're talking about a search for compromise, while moving to a higher level of trust, openness, and depth in the entire monitoring process—that much is evident. And, particularly important—I'd almost call it necessary—is the new image of Soviet participants in talks. Many people took notice when, as we were finalizing the components of the Paris agreement on conventional weapons in Europe—and that agreement reduces those weapons by a factor of 2.5, which is a very large cut—the talks were attended by the leader of the foreign policy department and the chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. So the diplomats and the military are not just pooling their efforts behind the scenes, they also are cooperating at official talks. That's very important.

[Zagladin] Just a moment. In order to prevent any confusion among our viewers—Aleksandr Sergeyevich, you said that sea-launched missiles weren't included. That should be missiles on surface ships.

[Dzasokhov] Absolutely.

[Zagladin] Submarine-launched missiles were included.

[Dzasokhov] That's right.

[Zorin] I think that Aleksandr Sergeyevich has basically answered the question of why some people are unhappy. It's natural. One side wanted to achieve everything, failed to achieve some points, and has been criticized for it. The other side also failed to achieve some points and people are exploiting that—some having good intentions, others not. I would just like to add one other idea about those who are currently unhappy with Moscow and the Moscow talks. The sharp reduction in strategic offensive weapons and the overall slowing of the arms race affect the very specific interests of some people. I know that it's hard to take figures in on TV, so I won't go overboard, but I would like to quote one for our viewers. A year ago one U.S. company alone—McDonnell Douglas—earned no less than $10.3 billion from arms production. A definite agreement has now been reached in Moscow. You have mentioned figures on what is going to be reduced. This means that somebody is going to be losing this planned income, and that is naturally a source of criticism. Admittedly, in this particular case I have mentioned McDonnell Douglas as an example of the U.S. military-industrial complex. When we spoke of the military-industrial complex in the past, we thought of the U.S. military-industrial complex. But let's take a sober look at things. It's not just the Americans—we have our own military-industrial complex. It's perfectly possible that not all representatives of that complex will be happy about the direction in which things are moving. That's another source of the discontent which, one way or another, is now surfacing in the press.

[Zagladin] I don't think that's the only thing, Valentin Sergeyevich. For starters, nobody has given our military-industrial complex a $10-billion handout.

[Zorin] But it did quite well all the same.

[Zagladin] It did quite well, but even that's not the point. These plants will noy be destroyed; they will be reequipped. This is a very complex procedure. The workers and engineers who will need to retrain will find it difficult. They will have to learn new skills. This too is a problem that has to be considered.

[Zorin] Aleksandr Sergeyevich. It's just occurred to me that this most important document which has just been signed in Moscow—I'm referring to the START Treaty—will be passed on to you by the diplomats and the military. It will be passed on to the Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and then to the Supreme Soviet for examination. This may be too direct a question, but I would like to ask you, as chairman of the committee, what the chances are—given the criticism we have mentioned—of the USSR Supreme Soviet ratifying this most important document?

[Dzasokhov] We need to rule out immediately the possibility that there will be unanimous and immediate approval and, consequently, ratification. There is great interest in all the treaty's provisions. I believe that the road to ratification will be travelled through the serious measures that we will have to take. Both you and Vadim Valentinovich have mentioned that section of our population that has worked for decades as a separate community, unlike Western industry, which has always had links between military and civil production. From this standpoint, they were perhaps even the most brilliant representatives of our technical intelligentsia. Of course, they are now facing a very serious dilemma. First, they have no experimental base. Second, they don't enjoy the priority appropriations they used to receive. There are many other aspects as well. So, in a human sense, you are right—this is quite a difficult situation. I think that the priority for both parliamentarians and statesmen is to push ahead with the entire conversion program. There have been isolated success stories but, regrettably, there is no sign as yet of a well-organized system for switching to civilian production those military-industry structures that are subject to conversion as a result of the talks. This is an exceptionally urgent task. I would even say that I'm sympathetic and understanding about the situation our comrades in this sector are experiencing.

Regarding the direct question you asked me, I accept that side of our task as well. We will have to think about it carefully. As far as the ratification process is concerned—and the Soviet-German documents showed this—I'd say that my prediction, of course, is that ratification will go ahead.

[Zagladin] Of course.

[Zorin] Thank you, I would just like to share some of my impressions. I am currently keeping a very close eye on U.S. Congress materials and all discussions of events in Moscow. You know, I have the impression that the situation on the Capitol is like the situation you described when you were talking about the Supreme Soviet.

I would now like to ask you to answer two letters from our viewers. Our viewers' letters generally play a very big role in our work. There is still a fair amount of loyalty to "Studio Nine." Our audience is not satisfied with the flow of information and wants in-depth analysis. Letters from members of this audience represent a kind of compass for us and provide us with food for thought. I would like to pick two letters out of the mailbag and ask you to answer them.

Here you are, Vadim Valentinovich. Here is a letter from Comrade Volobuyev, a secondary school teacher from Ryazan. Here's what he says: Politics is no fairy tale. Nothing happens as if by magic. For decades, profound mistrust and enmity toward one another were fostered in the Soviet and U.S. peoples. These feelings were fostered in at least two, if not three, generations, and then suddenly there came a drastic move away from hostility toward friendship. Can this move be considered sincere and lasting rather than a political game that could may change at any moment?

[Zagladin] In my view, this is an important question. Admittedly, our propaganda did not so much foster hatred of the American people as of U.S. imperialism and its representatives, but, needless to say, all these elements are intermingled. I can propose various ideas in response to this letter.

The first, in my view, is very important and consists of the fact that, along with fostering hatred, say, of our possible adversary, there were also other elements in the way our people were raised. First, there were the memories of the Great Patriotic War, World War II, in which both our peoples fought together, side by side, against one enemy. These memories—and they have never disappeared—will always remain. That is my first point.

Second, there is the fact that our people, all our country's peoples, have respected U.S. achievements in science and technology, particularly technology. Needless to say, sometimes this admiration for U.S. achievements went as far as absurd forms of pure plagiarism of anything American, including T-shirts and hats.

But there was always this respect for the U.S. people's talents regardless of the zero-sum idea being fostered in our minds that everything that is good for us must be bad for them, and vice versa.

Now when we compare, for instance, questionnaires and public opinion polls taken in our country and the United States, we can see that, despite decades of being encouraged to be hostile toward one another, the overwhelming majority of Americans and the overwhelming majority of Soviet people, regardless of nationality, now respect one another and harbor no suspicion toward one another and want to develop relations. Might this change? This does not depend on the peoples—it isn't people who change. If you look at the two countries' ruling circles, there are not yet any signs f the possibility of a shift of this kind, but neither can we rule this out. Therefore, and I agree with my friends here on this, we have to work without stopping, without taking a breather. It is reciprocity and the mutual development of mutual relations at all levels that is the best guarantee that there will be no change.

[Zorin] Aleksandr Sergeyevich, you too have a difficult letter to answer. It was written by a resident of Riga, Comrade (Aushkap), who evidently is a deep thinker and is trying to grasp the essence of the processes taking place. Here is what he says: Of course, we can only welcome the results of the two presidents' meeting in Moscow. Aren't we going to extremes again, as always? Two superpowers like the Soviet Union and the United States will never have interests that coincide. Both countries will always be rivals at the very least. That is, after all, grounds for enmity, and handshakes in the Kremlin are not enough to overcome that. There's the letter.

[Dzasokhov] Obviously, the question is indeed tinged with both the inertia of our thinking and the idea that we all developed over many years that Soviet-U.S. relations are always tense; I regard this attitude as part of the cold war period. Incidentally, those people who consider the Moscow meeting the first since the end of the cold war are right. You remember our trips to Malta and, earlier still, to Reykjavik. Of course, the atmosphere has changed, and the fallout from the cold war itself has already receded. It is therefore important from the methodological viewpoint to take note of the background against which our two states' presidents shook hands.

[Zagladin] After Paris and after....

[Dzasokhov] Yes. What do I want to say now? Needless to say, it would be totally unfeasible to think that our views both at the national and international levels should be considered absolutely identical.

The question of how we will flesh out the concept of a great power is another matter. If the parameters of militarization decline and constructive indicators rise, and if what we particularly need for our domestic interests and for our world economic relations—economic and trade dealings—should actually happen, then of course the field of our rivalry will narrow. If it does continue to exist, it will be completely different.

The volume of our trade relations has, after all, been mentioned here, and it is incomprehensible from the viewpoint of common sense: We are two great states, yet the volume of our trade with the United States is just two percent, and their trade with us totals 0.5 percent. This is an abnormal situation.

Therefore, I am absolutely in favor of encouraging everything necessary to ensure competition in science and technology exchange. What is more, if we are talking in a realistic and in-depth manner, I do not believe that we represent any competition for the United States in the world arena or the economic sphere—and that is the direction in which the world must develop, although there are still military tasks and security matters to be considered. That is clear, it goes without saying, at least for now.

On the international level, the Americans compete in these matters with today's Germany, with yesterday's and today's Japan, with the West European states, and even with the so-called three tigers that are rapidly appearing on the front lines. We need to integrate ourselves into the world economy, and London has sent a powerful signal. We must move toward this. We cannot remain an island.

So, I would like to say that we will of course have different views, but this is what is very important: It is often said that the Soviet Union and the United States have now begun to talk and they want to rule the world. For starters, that's just plain wrong; it's not the case at all. It's nothing like that at all. This does not mean that the former bipolar world, which is now becoming multipolar, is free of unpredictability. In this context, maybe, I've already found the source of our viewer's alarm here. It is Moscow and Washington's duty to ensure that a unipolar system does not emerge once the bipolar system has been replaced, and that we know that there are plenty of centers of power in the world.

Are not the events in the Persian Gulf or current events in Yugoslavia a reason for us to seek partnership with these centers of power through a constructive quest for an answer to these questions, increasingly ridding interstate relations of their confrontational nature? Might our interests rather develop in parallel and, in some areas, intersect, but not destructively?

[Zagladin] I would like to voice a couple of ideas here. I fully agree with what has already been said. We do indeed still have different interests, and that is a fact, but that does not mean that we do not have common interests. We do in fact have common interests.

For instance, preventing nuclear war is an interest we share with the United States. Each of our peoples and governments is interested in ensuring both regional and international security. It is no coincidence that environmental problems have constantly figured on the agenda during our talks for several years and that there has been some practical movement in this sphere. That is, there are spheres of common interests—and not only for our two countries—there are spheres in which our interests are different, and lastly there is a very specific sphere. This is a complicated factor, but it is real and exists virtually everywhere. In some areas our underlying interests may differ for whatever reason.

Take the Near East, for instance. The Americans themselves have said a great deal about the fact that they have deep-seated oil interests there. The common interest at the stage in question resided in punishing a criminal, punishing an aggressor, putting an end to aggression and war. So, our interests coincided on one level, but they may differ elsewhere next. While the motives may be different, the actions and interests are identical. It is a very complex sphere, and for that reason I also subscribe to what Aleksandr Sergeyevich said about the questions being understandable and our viewer's disquiet being understandable; there are a great many points here that require in-depth analysis, constant attention, and the appropriate action.

[Zorin] I think that one benefit of both the letters and our program is that not only do we talk to our viewers, but we also learn some things for ourselves and for politics in general, because people reflect and ponder and, evidently, have creative thoughts.

Let us come back—[coughs] excuse me—to the military problems discussed in Moscow. Needless to say, the strategic offensive arms reduction agreement is an outstanding event, an event that will indeed be studied for many decades as a key event. That is all true. There can be no two opinions on this. Let us look at the other side of the coin. A great deal will be destroyed, but there is enough left—and more—to destroy all life on earth several times over. There are no grounds for euphoria on our part just because we've signed and ratified this treaty!

On the other hand, I won't hide from you, my friends, one of my worries. When commenting on the meeting in Moscow, the military aspect is for some reason relegated to the back burner. I realize that the economy is very important, and regional problems are very important—that's all true—but I suspect that some press organs, in particular U.S. press organs—let me be frank and say it—reckon by and large that the work seems to have been done. Doesn't this mean that, now that the treaty has been signed, there will be some kind of pause, a switch to some different issues? At the same time, missiles carrying these formidable 80 Hiroshimas or more will be standing in our and in U.S. silos. That is a fact now and in the future. Aleksandr Sergeyevich?

[Dzasokhov] Valentin Sergeyevich, it's quite logical to put the question like that. We have to act to ensure that there's no pause. I would wing it, but I would bear certain considerations in mind. I think that we could now contemplate, on the basis of European experience, working to set up standing Soviet-U.S. or, maybe, new multilateral mechanisms. I think there would be much appeal in, for instance, an institute or structure to carry out regular, in-depth examinations of all military-political problems arising between the State Department and the USSR Foreign Ministry.

I can say that this exists. It is a question of the almost integral nature of this work. That's very important. There's a number of questions that are very characteristic of and topical for us. We must, of course, do everything we can to ensure that all the problems of military reform are dealt with. This is a very important issue.

Let us now talk about the military aspect. If my memory serves me, the U.S. federal debt [dolg], that is, the state debt, is now equal to U.S. military spending [sentence as heard]. This is a vast sum, and in our country I think that there is even more of a contrast in this ratio. There are grounds for the disarmament question remaining a top priority. It will be a priority if the process is continued without the pause that sometimes develops due to the human mentality following any major successes. There must be no breathing space here. I think that is how things will develop in this field.

[Zorin] Thank you. I would like to use the few minutes remaining to us for another question. You know that economic problems, including U.S. aid for our country's economic restructuring, occupied a considerable place in the Moscow talks. It is no secret that the view is current in our country that the Americans are not helping us for the sake of it. The following question arises: Is the United States, say, really interested, if everything goes well—and we hope that everything goes well, even if not immediately—in having another powerful competitor on the world arena in 10, 12, or 15 years? After all, the United States already has more than enough competitors today. So, is it worth helping the Soviet Union? Aleksandr Sergeyevich.

[Dzasokhov] I would first like to express the wish that U.S. legislators raise their interest in economic and trade cooperation to the level that we can sense in the U.S. Administration's activity. In actual fact, it has become practice for both the Senate and the Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, to compete with one another and constantly impose various embargoes or resolutions regarding volumes of cooperation. There are also, I would remind you, the restrictions imposed by the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls, and so on and so forth.

Needless to say, Most Favored Nation status is now taking practical shape. This is a topical issue. In my view, the administration must sense the legislators' support, and then our potential will be revealed.

But we too have opponents who say, with regard to the Soviet Union's economic might and our integration into the international economic system, that all these ideas may make the country an economic appendage, a supplier of raw materials. That is a serious reproach. We must constantly take preventive measures against being a so-called supplier of raw materials.

We have been a raw-material appendage to a considerable extent. We supplied the world market primarily with oil, timber, metal, and so on without any in-depth study. We have very poor technology, and therefore the tasks of our integration, notably in the context of the G-7 agreements, and the development of our scientific and technical ties with the U.S. are in the interests of enhancing our economic efficiency.

The most important thing is that the USSR may be an economic competitor at some stage, perhaps in the distant future—I don't rule this out. In the Pacific, the ocean of the 21st century. This forecast may develop via economic channels. But the immediate future is still bound up with the fact that we must raise the entire level of our economic and technical activity. At this stage, I see no reason for looking to get ourselves into the dangerous situation whereby from the U.S. standpoint we are competitors, but from our standpoint we are just a supplier of raw materials. As I see it, there is no danger of that.

Admittedly, major and landmark questions of this kind must be resolved in a competent and skilled fashion, but that depends on the protagonists, on the people concerned.

[Zorin] Vadim Valentinovich.

[Zagladin] We are coming to the end of our time and I would like to take a look at what we have said from a broader viewpoint. Our postwar foreign policy, despite the fact that it always proclaimed its noble aims, made many interesting proposals, and attained definite results—I would remind you of the Helsinki Final Act 1975—but nevertheless it failed to protect us from the arms race, an exhausting race that exceeded all normal needs and reasonable limits. Our pre-perestroyka foreign policy significantly helped create the preconditions for the current crisis in the country, from which it has not as yet escaped. From the very outset the foreign policy of perestroyka set about helping resolve the country's domestic tasks and thus, above all, normalizing the world situation, putting an end to confrontation, and establishing normal relations with the whole world.

So, the Moscow meeting represents a very important step on this path, whatever problems remain open or unresolved. It fits in with this both in the military-political context, in the political context, the economic context, and the international context. I think that this meeting is a symbol of our policy today—one of the most important symbols—it shows that this policy is indeed geared to resolving the country's pressing tasks—the tasks facing every Soviet person—and those problems that worry literally every one of us. But as in the past, now too—it has always been and will always be the case—foreign policy can do nothing if it is not upheld by a powerful support base, by the country itself, by its people, by every Soviet person. Ultimately the success of our reform plan, the success of perestroyka within the country, and the success of our foreign policy activity are inextricably linked.

By and large we now have a situation where our domestic policy accomplishes many foreign policy tasks while our foreign policy resolves domestic issues in many respects. These aims are inextricably linked. I think that if we all consider properly what is happening in Moscow, along with all the problems that we have to resolve, our main conclusion will be this: Everyone must do everything they can to improve things within the country, then foreign policy will go better, and our lives will improve.

[Zorin] Well, we've used up our airtime. It only remains for me to thank you for taking part in this conversation and thank our viewers. I think that those viewers who want TV programs to provide answers to questions that interest them rather than just verbal sparring will have been helped by this program to find some answers to some of these questions. Thank you. Until we meet again. You've been watching "Studio Nine."

Petrovskiy Cited on UN Role, U.S. Relations

LD1308173791 Moscow TASS in English 1721 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 13 TASS—The United Nations "is capable of playing the role of 'legal supports' to help the world enter into a new political order," Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy wrote in the newspaper IZVESTIA today.

The Soviet diplomat expressed the view that the U.N. role in world politics is especially high at the current stage of transition from the "cold war" to relations of peace and cooperation on all international issues. At the same time he noted that some provisions of the U.N. Charter, drafted immediately after the Second World War, became obsolete, in particular, reference to Germany, Japan and Italy as hostile states.

Petrovskiy emphasized that the forthcoming administrative reform of the U.N. apparatus, and the reform of the general assembly and its main committees will bring the structure of the organisation closer to modern problems, streamline the entire machinery for the maintenance of peace, security and cooperation.

On the whole, he said, the United Nations will fit into the system of international relations by reforming rather than dismantling the charter and existing structures.

Speaking about Soviet-U.S. relations, Petrovskiy said that they will continue to play an important role in the world. "The Soviet Union and U.S. are considered by the world community as superpowers capable of offsetting any military danger," he continued. "They are crucial for solving any global problem and, primarily, settling international crises."

Putting Soviet-U.S. relations "on the natural basis of universal human values and national interests is fully in the interests of the entire world community," Petrovskiy said.

At the same time, Petrovskiy stressed that the superpowers cannot oppose themselves to the rest of the world, let alone pursue power politics or impose their own will.

"It is in their own interests to interact with all members of the world community," he noted.

Petrovskiy Receives ASEAN, PRC Delegations

LD1308225191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow, 13 Aug (TASS)—Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, today received the heads of the diplomatic missions of the ASEAN countries in Moscow. They exchanged opinions on issues to be discussed at the upcoming 46th session of the UN General Assembly. The need was stressed to continue to enhance the UN role in forming a new world order—a system of peace, security and cooperation, which relies on the authority and potential of the United Nations.

The same day, Vladimir Petrovskiy received a delegation from the PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs on issues of political studies. They examined issues relating to foreign policy planning, the increasing significance of global and regional security structures in the multipolar world, and the role of Soviet-Chinese relations as a stability factor.

CSCE Committee Member Discusses Yugoslavia

OW1308054391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1520 GMT Aug 91

[Report by diplomatic correspondent Pyotr Vasilyev on interview with Yuriy Deryabin, Soviet representative on the CSCE Senior Officials Committee, by unnamed correspondents from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; date and place not given; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A correspondent from "DP" [Diplomatic Panorama] met with Yuriy Deryabin, the Soviet representative on the CSCE Senior Officials Committee. Mr. Deryabin stated that the mechanism for regulating crisis situations, created in the frame of a common European forum of 35, was a "well-timed measure." In particular, this confirms the special meeting which took place in Prague regarding the situation in Yugoslavia. "At the moment we can openly say that the opportunities of the CSCE are not great. We are beginning with nothing, we do not have a president, we have no experience, but we will gain it with time," remarked the diplomat.

Mr. Deryabin named the two positive sides which allow one to hope that the present mechanism will be effective: firstly, the moral- political meaning—the authority of 35 governments (there is hope that Yugoslavians will listen to their suggestions and recommendations). Secondly, there is hope that the row of decisions taken by the Committee will result in the beginning of a political dialog. In particular, on sending a mission of observers, a mission of good services to Yugoslavia.

Yuriy Deryabin remarked on how important it was for the Yugoslavs to attempt to control the crisis on their own. At the same time, he emphasized that they were not against using the opportunities of the CSCE and the EC to find a solution. He continued, however, that it was most important for the Yugoslavs to first use their own powers.

Regarding the future internationalization of the conflict, according to the words of the diplomat, the approach is very reserved, as in Yugoslavia itself, and in the Soviet Union and in many other countries of the CSCE.

"Even before the meeting it was said that the Yugoslavs had no desire for their question to be discussed by the U.N. Security Council. We support them in this," emphasized Mr. Deryabin.

Before the Prague meeting the idea of sending a subdivision of international forces to maintain peace in Yugoslavia was also proposed, (possibly from the EC, the CSCE, and the Western European Union,—a "peace keeping force" after the manner of the U.N.'s "blue helmets"—"DP".) The Yugoslavs were against this idea. The Soviet Union supported Yugoslavia also in this question: "We consider that at the present, there is no need for the crisis to become international, based on the combined efforts of the Yugoslavs and the opportunities of the CSCE,"—the diplomat stated.

"As before, the CSCE will give its full attention to this problem. We have already called for the next meeting of the Committee to be in the beginning of September," Yuriy Deryabin explained. At this meeting 35 governments will discuss the situation after the cease fire and the regulation of political dialog. The situation will be evaluated and the appropriate decisions made with regard to the Yugoslavian crisis.

It is no secret that the position of the Soviet Union during the collective discussion of the Yugoslavian question on the eve of the Prague meeting was a very cautious one, and in some ways even cruel. This is explained by the situation in the Baltics and in the Transcaucasus. Mr. Deryabin did not omit to say that the present problems could arise in "a whole row of countries," for which the mechanism of the special situation might also be adopted.

He also remarked that in agreement with procedures, any country in the CSCE has the right to suggest summoning a special meeting of the committee, as long as it has the support of at least 12 other governments. "Theoretically I cannot deny the possibility, that some time in the future a summons for such a meeting on urgent questions could be called regarding our country, in particular, regarding the Baltics."

The diplomat pointed out one important aspect in the activities of the mechanism for special situations—"all decisions are made based upon consensus and in agreement with the country in question."

The Soviet position with regard to Yugoslavia remains as before: on the threshhold of the Prague meeting an official statement of the Soviet government was made public in an appeal to the Presidium of Yugoslavia to cease fire, to sit down at the negotiating table and decide their problems themselves. The importance of not supporting either side in the conflict and of avoiding further internationalization of the conflict was noted.

Yuriy Deryabin commented on the Soviet position in the following way: "We do not want to complicate the delicate processes which are taking place in Yugoslavia." He did not agree that Soviet support for the demand for territorial integrity and the indivisibility of Yugoslavia stemmed from internal reasons, in particular the Baltic question, and the attempt not to make a precedent of internationalizing problem-solving.

"The USSR has constant two-way contact with Yugoslavia today on practically all levels, we are involved in dialogs with all sies," the diplomat emphasized. "As before, we feel that he division of Slovenia and Croatia would give rise to unwanted processes.

PRAVDA Reports CSCE Meeting on Yugoslavia

PM1308141391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Aug 91 Second Edition p 7

[Correspondent A. Krushinskiy report: "The 'Crisis Management Mechanism' in Action. Events in Yugoslavia—on the CSCE Agenda"]

[Text] Prague, 11 Aug—The 35 member countries' flags and six cubicles for simultaneous translation into the official CSCE languages (including Russian)—these are the mandatory attributes of any international forum held within the Helsinki process framework. One specific aspect is that representatives of the FRG and the SFRY are at the head of the meters-long table running along the walls of the Cerninsky Palace hall.

The first is chairing the meeting because the previous (and very first) sitting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Helsinki process member countries was actually held in his country, in Berlin. The second got a seat on the improvised presidium because the events in Yugoslavia provided the pretext for convening the committee of senior CSCE officials.

This committee, set up at the Paris meeting of the Helsinki process member countries' leaders, was assigned the mission of "activating" the mechanism of consultations and cooperation in connection with emergency situations, adopted at the Berlin meeting of the 35 foreign ministers. As you can see, we are talking about new phenomena which are just becoming a regular part of international life. This process is naturally accompanied by complications.

Let me remind our readers that senior officials in Prague already discussed Yugoslavia's problems just over a month ago. At that meeting they worked virtually nonstop and adopted a series of important decisions: They called on the warring sides to immediately cease fire and set up two commissions—one of observers and one of good offices. Since that time, however, the conflagration of internecine strife has shifted from Slovenia to Croatia, becoming even bloodier, and the need for the "crisis management mechanism" reappeared.

An extraordinary event aggravated the worry felt by many participants in the present meeting and the journalists who gathered to cover it. The 34 delegations took their seats at the established hour on 8 August, but not a word was heard from the Yugoslav delegation. As a matter of fact, the reason proved to be not a "boycott" (of which the SFRY was initially suspected by some), but... a technical malfunction on the Czechoslovak Airlines airplane on the Sofia-Belgrade-Prague route. Due to this delay, the committee did not begin its work until 1900 hours, and many people, recalling the previous meeting, prepared for an all-night vigil. This did not prove necessary, however, and the meeting fitted in the planned two-day schedule.

The text of two appeals were adopted: On a complete cease-fire (specifically welcoming the SFRY Presidency's 6 August decision) and on the upcoming political dialogue in Yugoslavia. There was confirmation of the readiness to send to that country (if it so wished) a mission of good offices to act as mediator. It was decided to expand the composition of the commission of cease-fire observers (which was hitherto limited to the EC framework) by including non-EC countries. Finally, agreement was reached to meet once more in Prague during the first week of September.

These decisions were unanimously adopted by the 35 countries' senior officials. Nor could it have been otherwise: After all, no votes were taken on any measures within the Helsinki process framework—the principle of consensus dominated there. This means that all adopted documents are like the "tip of the iceberg"—the bulk of the work involves mutual consultations, coordination of positions, and the quest for mutually acceptable compromises. It is not surprising that the committee members came up against procedural problems at their first "crisis management meeting." The fact that everything went smoothly on this occasion is a good sign and indicates that the CSCE "crisis management mechanism" is being gradually fine-tuned and is gaining the features of an effective peacemaking instrument.

Yu. Deryabin, the Soviet representative on the senior officials' committee told me after the meeting's conclusion: "This meeting convincingly confirmed the good timing in creating new cooperation mechanisms within the CSCE framework, especially on the solution of crisis situations which emerge in the future." He added: "All countries want to ensure that these mechanisms function effectively. There were no signs of confrontation during the session."

Shishlin Commentary on 'Agenda for the Future'

PM1208154791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Aug 91 Second Edition p 6

["Observer's Opinion" article by Nikolay Shishlin, deputy chief of the Progaganda Subdepartment of the CPSU Central Committee's Ideological Department: "Agenda for the Future"]

[Text] All past records for the number of international meetings at the highest level were broken in the summer of 1991. Moscow, Washington, London, Paris, Rome, Bonn—and many other cities—welcomed a long string of foreign visitors. No sooner had one statesman been sent off, and the guard of honor smartly marched before a newly arrived leader from abroad. This endless chain of visits and meetings was prompted not by any yearning for travel or by politicians' vain desire always to be in the public eye, but by the imperious need to find solutions to the problems facing our uneasy, changing, and so interdependent world.

Yes, an end has been put to the "cold war." Neither universal accord nor the desired harmony will automatically follow. The path leading to them is smooth [tornaya], but nobody can travel this path in isolation.

August is the month when people go on leave. But not everyone, of course. Nonetheless a fleeting break, something akin to a relative lull, can occur in international political life. It is a time to ponder the results of the past and get an idea of what awaits us in the near future, of the tasks whose solution could be tackled even today.

The world, which was split and driven by fear for something like four decades, had one main concern—to arm itself. States' military budgets, primarily those of the United States and the USSR, grew each year. Nothing was denied the military-industrial complexes. Political duelists on both sides of the barricade exchanged angry speeches, covertly and overtly preparing for the worst. True enough, the self-preservation instinct restrained Washington and Moscow politicians from pressing the button of the infernal weapon. To make up for this, confrontation grew wherever there was no direct danger of crashing into the nuclear abyss. It is easy to imagine how many opportunities for good deeds were lost as a result of the frenzied pace at which military expenditures grew. Is this the only evil of the bad times? Regional conflicts multiplied at the cost of human lives and lost hopes. The environment—the animate and inanimate nature whose cure will take decades—fell victim to blind enmity.

Reciprocal fear provided a breeding ground for a disastrous policy to germinate and produce its evil blooms. Nonetheless, it seems as if the irreversible march of events has been halted thanks to the Soviet leadership's new political thinking. Let us not forget to add, however that it was also thanks to the suitable response given by the United States and the West to new the Soviet ideas.

The past few years can be described as the time for weeding the field of international politics, and a time for clearing away the thistles of hatred, schizophrenic suspiciousness, and implacable ideological prejudices.

There is no need to go over the chronicle of Soviet leaders' talks with their counterparts from Western countries over the last few years. This can be left to the historians. The curtain of fear was not lifted overnight, nor did the realization of the monstrous nature of inertia emerge from just one single rigorous analysis. Honesty and readiness for compromises and concessions also helped steer Western policy along a healthy channel. The age of the most acute arguments yielded to the quest for agreement.

So, what has been achieved? There has been a resolute beginning of the process for reducing and eliminating arms, including nuclear arms. The Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, the Vienna decisions on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, and now the Treaty on the Reduction of Strategic Offensive Weapons [START]—these are the landmarks along the path traversed from the ominous brink where we found ourselves in the mid-eighties.

Our relations with the Western community are now distinguished by steadily reviving contacts. Fruitless verbal arguments along the lines of "Idiot yourself" have receded into the past. The dialogue now is what it should be—frank, fruitful, and aimed at achieving mutually acceptable results.

These specific words can be applied to the talks with foreign politicians in Moscow that were held over the past few months and that brought us so many visitors. They can also be applied to the atmosphere during the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Its crowning event—the signing of the START Treaty—was already mentioned. The attempts to find an area to jointly apply efforts in the field of economic cooperation are also significant and by no means unsuccessful. They extend to the energy sphere, to cooperation in boosting our domestic food production, and to a sensible reorganization of the system for the distribution of available resources. The assimilation of U.S. practice in conversion and in switching modern technologies from military to civilian industries can be extremely useful for us. There is no doubt that the granting of Most Favored Nation status to the Soviet Union and the upcoming ratification of the Soviet-U.S. trade treaty will extend the boundaries of the possible in business ties between the two world giants. Boundaries which, regrettably, are extremely modest at present.

Qualitatively new elements have emerged and are becoming firmly established as norms in talks between the Soviet and U.S. Presidents. The joint Soviet-U.S. statements on the Near East, on Yugoslavia, and on Soviet-U.S. collaboration in Central America prove that the Soviet Union and the United States are abandoning the role of eternal rivals in regional conflicts and are successfully mastering the roles of responsible and reliable partners.

The steps to overcome crisis situations is also part of clearing the field of international politics of the weeds that stifled all developments that were in the least bit healthy during the "cold war" years. When referring to regional conflicts, it is customary to think and talk of Afghanistan, the Near East, Angola, Mozambique, Cambodia, or Central America, for example. The European continent itself, however, was a vast—and potentially the most terrible—zone not of some regional conflict, but of a universal conflict.

The past decades saw neither peace, nor quiet, nor blessed grace in Europe. The Soviet Union had to back the immutability of bloc policy with actions like the ones it took in the GDR in June 1953, in Hungary in October 1956, and in Czechoslovakia in August 1968, when the rumble of tank tracks was louder than politicians' voices. These few words indicate only what was on the surface, however. The invisible costs of relations, routinely termed as fraternal, were much more extensive and more dangerous for the state interests of the Soviet Union and its close neighbors.

The burden of the past, the inability to work in the new fashion, the destruction of customary ties, and the disruption of our economy are now having a most painful effect on the USSR's relations with its former allies. It will take time, political courage, common sense, and good will to repair these relations and get them going again. The groundwork for this effort is being prepared by the current transformations in Central and East Europe and in the Soviet Union.

The stacks of mowed weeds are withering in the field of international politics. It cannot be said that the field has already been cleared and is in an ideal state for sowing—but the time for sowing is upon us. This is the qualitative feature of the emerging field in the development of international relations which, let us hope, will become an age of partnership and joint good deeds by East and West, by North and South.

The question of our country's organic entry into the international community was already on the agenda of the "7 + 1" meeting in London and of the latest round of conversations between the USSR president and the U.S. President. I have read, and I am familiar with, the opinions of our sophisticated skeptics that Gorbachev apparently found himself in a position of discomfort or, to put it more sharply, weakness in London. This may well be so. The USSR's domestic situation remains grave.

People who bothered to read the speeches by Gorbachev and Bush during the U.S. President's latest visit to Moscow probably noticed that there were moments when the visitor (are his speech writers to blame here?) slipped into grating lecturing. There is no need to either simplify or embellish the present, in fact, it may even be harmful. But let us recall the parable of the Gospel. "The Kingdom of heaven can be compared to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and sowed in his field: Which indeed is the least of all seeds, but when it has grown, it is the greatest among herbs and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in its branches."

I am convinced that the USSR's full and effective participation not just on foreign political issues but also in the world's economic affairs is a key aspect of the series of tasks facing us in the nineties. Are we capable of coping with this task on our own? I think not. But it is also true that the "grain of mustard seed" sown at the London meeting and during the U.S. President's visit to the USSR is a universal concern.

I must admit that I dislike the reasoning some of our politicians and journalists have adopted. Its essence boils down to an unsophisticated argument: If a colossus like the Soviet Union collapses, it will be bad for everyone. The logic of interdependence and collaboration is different: The contemporary world's political and economic problems will prove to be unendurable if the USSR's intellectual, natural, and economic potential is excluded from their solution.

Outstanding problems inherited from the evil and frenzied years of the "cold war" remain as important as ever on the agenda for the future. They include, of course, the world's oversaturation with arms. Whatever has been done, primarily through Moscow's and Washington's efforts, has been done. Some more complex calculations lie in store. They apply to nuclear and conventional arms, the expansion of the circle of the participants in talks, and reduction to a minimum—if not to zero—of the number of purchasers of terrible armaments and the technology for making them.

The Soviet Union, judging by the summit meeting materials, believes that the START Treaty's conclusion is an incentive for fresh Soviet-U.S. talks on disarmament with broader coverage of various categories of forces and types of weapons. The United States has adopted a position of restraint or, to put it better, a wait-and-see attitude. Let us work on the implementation of what is intended, and we can take another look later.

It is not worth overdramatizing these differences. We also may find it useful to take a closer look. As a matter of fact, the United States itself is adopting programs to cut back military bases at home and abroad, and military expenditures are being reduced not just on the principles of reciprocity but also unilaterally. We also need—and common sense prompts us—to act along similar avenues.

Having taken a deep breath after many years of talks and having enjoyed deserved congratulations on their historic success, the USSR and the United States must once again sit around the disarmament negotiating table. Let us hope that the new nature of relations between them and the growing mutual understanding will impart a completely different speed—not that of Geneva or Vienna—to the talks process.

Overcoming regional conflicts and preventing them also remain on the future agenda. I mention prevention because nobody knows where they might flare up tomorrow. Just two or three years ago nobody would have thought or believed that the Yugoslav land would be gripped by fratricidal strife. Even where the flames have been extinguished, embers might be smoldering beneath the ash.

The awareness that regional conflicts are a common misfortune and a common danger for all mankind is upon us. In this regard, the Iraqi aggression proved to be a cruel and multifaceted lesson. Lessons must be learned by all—the victim, the predator, and the international community. They must be learned in full. This education can be facilitated by enhancing the role of the revived United Nations Organization and its institutions. In my opinion, it is time for UN members to read the organization's Charter afresh, bring it in line with the radically changed world, and show concern for the incalculably greater effectiveness of the decisions it adopts .

The principle of national sovereignty is sacred, the principle of noninterference in other countries' internal affairs is sacred, but the right of states and mankind right to live in peace is equally sacred. It is incumbent upon the family of mankind to be indefatigably concerned about this with foresight.

These remarks do not claim to list all items on the agenda for the future. Having mentioned the main points, I would like to emphasize the obvious: We are entering a new era of international relations. The world that is currently undergoing renewal has assigned a fitting place to the Soviet Union, a transformed Union which is emerging from its trials, its passionate battles, and its difficult quest for the right path to a fair and prosperous society.

The sound of battle drums, the favorite instrument of our fundamentalists, is deafening. The words they address to the people are hysterical and unrestrained, oozing confusion and malice. With enviable flair, they unleash a waterfall of nauseating exhortations against every fresh and fearless idea. These panicmongers sense and realize that our ship of state has sailed out of its old and silted bay, and it is now in open waters. Suddenly there is a commotion, almost a mutiny with the slogan "Full Steam Astern!"

Yesterday's forces are capable of obstructing the country's advance to better things, but they are unable to halt this advance. I am convinced that, upon entering the qualitatively new field of international relations, we will be able to gain at least two substantial advantages. The first is a firmer international underpinning of the country's renewal and rebirth. The second is the affirmation of the fatherland's constructive role in ennobling and harmonizing international relations. But there is a multitude of tasks ahead. Especially at home.

United States & Canada

TASS Cites U.S. Statement on Arms Sales

LD1308093991 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington August 13 TASS— The U.S. State Department on Monday rejected as misleading a report asserting that the United States has become the major arms exporter to Third World countries.

The report by the Congressional Research Service was released on Sunday.

State Department spokeswoman Cynthia Whittlesey said the report was founded on dollar-value comparisons, which are misleading.

She said "the largest share of U.S. military exports are not for weapons but for construction, spare parts, and support".

Whittlesey also noted that U.S. exports are more expensive due to high technology they are based on. She stressed that other major arms exporters often resort to subsidised costs or barter deals, which conceals the actual costs of arms sales.

Details of Planned Closure of U.S. Bases Abroad

PM1208153291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Union Edition p 5

[IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Zubko report, accompanied by reprint of sketch map from Danish newspaper POLITIKEN: "Dismantling Military Bases: Reduction in American Military Presence in the World"]

[Text] Stockholm—The other day IZVESTIYA (see No. 182) published a TASS report that the U.S. Defense Department had decided to close a further 79 military bases and other facilities in Europe.

The Danish newspaper POLITIKEN has now supplemented this information by publishing a map from REUTER summarizing information on the U.S. bases worldwide which will be eliminated entirely by 1995 or whose activity will be reduced.

Thus one-third of the U.S. military bases and facilities currently in existence abroad will be closed by that date.

These plans will affect, in particular, 140 U.S. facilities in Germany, 22 in Britain, 15 in South Korea, and 18 in Greece. The states designated to be affected by the reduction include Japan, the Philippines, Italy, Australia, Turkey, the Bermuda Islands, and so forth (the map indicates the main countries where there is a U.S. presence).

All this is clearly the result of the end of the cold war and the strengthening of confidence between the United States and the USSR. True, even after 1995 the U.S. military department will still have more than 1,000 bases and facilities abroad. So the Pentagon still has much work to do to dismantle them....

U.S. To Expand SE Asia Military Presence

PM1208133791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Aug 91 First Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "Observer's Column" article: "Contingency Plan"]

[Text] On visiting Manila, Kenneth Quinn, deputy assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, was firm. At a meeting with Philippine journalists he said that American troops will leave the Subic Bay base in the Philippines if that country's senate refuses to ratify the bases agreement recently concluded between the two countries. The official representative of the U.S. State Department did not disguise the fact that Subic Bay is "exceptionally important" for the United States.

As already reported, under the accord the United States would retain the Subic Bay naval station until the year 2001 in exchange for compensation of $203 million per annum. Control over the remaining facilities, including the giant Clark Air Base, destroyed by Mount Pinatubo, will be handed over to the Philippine side by the Pentagon in the very near future. During preliminary voting in the upper chamber of the Philippine parliament, however, 16 out of 23 senators voted against ratifying the bases treaty. Quinn's arrival was determined precisely by the discomforting outcome of this vote, albeit preliminary. If we leave the Philippines, Manila, he threatened at the end of his news conference, should no longer count on U.S. military and economic aid.

At the same time, however, Washington is not ruling out the possibility that it will be left without any bases in the Philippines. A kind of contingency plan has already been drawn up in the U.S. capital. According to a report in THE NEW YORK TIMES, the United States is actively seeking the opportunity to expand its military presence in Southeast Asia and is holding consultations with its ASEAN allies to this end. According to the newspaper's information, even before Pinatubo's eruption, the U.S. Administration had asked the governments of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand about possibly expanding the U.S. Armed Forces' use of military facilities in those countries.

At the end of July and the beginning of August, Admiral C. Larson, commander of the Pacific Fleet, visited a number of ASEAN countries. He held talks in those countries capitals about transferring the bulk of the military personnel and combat equipment from Clark Field to military facilities in the region. THE NEW YORK TIMES also stressed that Washington is ready to regard such a deployment as an interim measure, as the Pentagon is studying the question of constructing a major new air base in that region.

Even without this "contingency plan," the Pentagon has already established itself very solidly in Southeast Asia. This applies first and foremost to Singapore, with which the United States signed a memorandum of understanding last fall. Under this, the U.S. Air Force and Navy have obtained the possibility of using military facilities on Singapore territory. And not simply to use these facilities, but also to be present there on a rotational basis.

How important a role Singapore has begun to play in U.S. military plans in the region can also be judged from the following fact. The other day two Pentagon emissaries turned up on this island state at the same time. The first was the aforementioned Adm. C. Larson. The other was General J. Adams, U.S. Air Force commander in the Pacific, who not only held the appropriate talks but also attended joint air force exercises, in which American F-16 fighter-bombers took part.

It seems that Brunei will very soon be playing an equally considerable role in the Pentagon's strategy in South East Asia. The United States has been able to conclude an agreement with that country similar to the one with Singapore.

All these facts show that the United States is seeking not just to retain but to expand its military presence in the Asia-Pacific region. It is doing this at a time when most countries in Asia, including Southeast Asia, are welcoming (as was confirmed, incidentally, at the last meeting of ASEAN foreign ministers, held in Kuala Lumpur) the positive processes under way in the international arena, processes which make it possible to reduce confrontation and tension.

USSR Urged To Set National Interests, Goals

PM1308085191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 First Edition p 3

["Observer's Opinion" article by Aleksandr Golts: "But Are We Partners?"]

[Text] Thus the Soviet-American summit meeting has ended successfully. So successfully that it is now time for the presidential speechwriters and journalists to start seeking a suitable equivalent for the word "historic," as the summit exceeded all limits on this word's use.

What is to be done here if so much indicates a truly historic breakthrough in relations between our two countries, and if the meeting's results confirm the thesis that our states are moving toward a new era of cooperation. The material evidence for this is the Treaty on the Reduction of Strategic Offensive Arms [START], which, if it does not stop the qualitative enhancement of nuclear weapons, will certainly halt and reverse their quantitative buildup.

The statement of readiness to make joint efforts to settle conflicts in the Near East cannot be ignored. It seems that Washington does not go along with the self-destructive talk recently heard in our country about the decline of the USSR's influence on world affairs. The U.S. President has also stated his intention to seek to obtain Most Favored Nation status for us, to remove restrictions on credit, and to secure congressional approval for the trade agreement with the USSR.

Finally we come to M.S. Gorbachev, to whom the transatlantic partner sought to be loyal even during a meeting which constantly reminded us of the instability that has seized the country. As befits a courteous guest, he preferred not to notice his hospitable hosts kicking one another under the official table. He did not pay—openly at least—heed to Russian President Boris Yeltsin's "conspicuous absence" from the talks. Moreover, contrary to the calculations of those who organized the carnage at the Belorussian-Lithuanian border, this tragic incident failed to undermine the summit meeting. After stating that the Americans would not "support those who sought independence in order to replace the tyranny by local depotism imposed from afar" and would not help those "who encourage suicidal nationalism grounded in interethnic hatred," George Bush returned home, leaving us to sort out our problems.

At first glance, the American President discounted the advice of those who recommended that he "put the squeeze" on the Soviet Union by exploiting its present weakness. But that is at first glance—for Bush, albeit in a pretty mild way, did nevertheless state quite clearly the "obstacles" standing in the way of our "new partner's" development: Specifically, Soviet aid to Cuba, our policy toward the Baltic states, and the northern territories issue constantly being raised by Japan, which claims a number of the Kuril Islands.

On hearing of these "obstacles—and the U.S. President dwelt on them several times during the Moscow meeting—I, and many of my colleagues, painfully sensed that familiar atmosphere of past years. After all, virtually every summit meeting has been constrained by the American side with several prior conditions, principally concerning military problems. We have been required to eliminate intermediate-range missiles, to dismantle the Krasnoyarsk radar station, and to concur absolutely with the Pentagon interpretation of the provisions of the treaty on reducing conventional arms in Europe. Incidentally, it should be made clear that we too have made demands: The USSR unabashedly stated its own concern, whether caused by Pershings, Tomahawks, or the implementation of the Star Wars program. The solutions which emerged as a result of the discussion cannot be interpreted as one-sided satisfaction of U.S. demands. The Americans were ready here to listen and, most importantly, pay heed to their partner's wishes. That is only natural:The security sphere is precisely the sphere where the United States has an completely clear interest in success.

Washington has been much less inclined to consider Moscow's position on other problems: The unconditional withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan and the cessation of all aid to the Sandinistas in Nicaragua have been demanded of us. Yet it cannot be said that the past years have left the Soviet Union alone with debts—real or imaginary. If desired, Washington could also be presented with a pretty hefty bill: Here you have Grenada and Panama plus all the vileness associated with the interference in Nicaragua, ranging from the mining of a sovereign republic's ports to the direct supply of weapons to members of the opposition. But American politicians are not fazed by this.

The problem of protecting human rights has given particular scope for moralizing. Lists of "refuseniks" and dissidents, questions concerning the emigration of Soviet Jews, and freedom to leave the country—all of these issues have moved from one Soviet-American meeting to another. All of these have been mandatory conditions for the improvement of Soviet-American relations.

It is not difficult to see that our country has met or is on the way to meeting most of these conditions, including those about which our president, and at that time he was still only general secretary, spoke—not without indignation—in 1985: "These gentlemen have gone so far as to give the U.S. Administration the task of forcing us to change our system and our Constitution!" I am not inclined to consider this to be the result of the superefficiency of American policy, nor do I intend to seek the "hand of Washington" and the malevolence of "CIA agents." What is ultimately involved here is a yielding to common sense. Was not the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan vitally necessary for us in actual fact? Had the absence of democracy really not turned into an internal brake on our development?

But, on the other hand, I do not want to liken this country to the young boy from the story who used to say "This for my own good" when brought to be thrashed... I am certain that the American ultimatums have not only not advanced but, on the contrary, have actually hindered the solution of many urgent problems. After all, these demands have been made to a great power, while we have so long feared "losing face."

In making its ultimatums, Washington has been governed, I suspect, not at all by "general human values." We are talking about diplomatic tactics, because, by driving the USSR into a corner, U.S. diplomacy has obtained freedom to maneuver and the opportunity to decide for itself whether to bide its time or, on the contrary, to start acting energetically—not to mention the fact that in many people's eyes the United States scored points as the fighter against the "evil empire." It is no wonder that more and more new conditions have emerged in the process of the American-Soviet dialogue.

And now, when confrontation has retreated into the past, it would seem necessary to break this pernicious cycle—yet we are again confronted with conditions. Washington's support for Japanese demands is particularly revealing here. "A few brief words uttered by President Bush at the Moscow meeting enraptured Japan," THE WASHINGTON POST reports, "and those words were 'northern territories.'" In Japan, the news that Bush had urged the Soviet Union to resolve this territorial dispute was seen as very important. The underlying strategy was understood perfectly well in Tokyo. "This position reflects the strategy of Washington, which by doing Japan a favor hopes in turn to obtain reciprocal concessions," MAINICHI has pointed out. Thus the United States is acting like a kind of universal justice of the peace who can support certain countries' claims against others. This fully accords with the American concept of the "new world order." What we have here are partnership relations—only they exist between Washington and Tokyo at the Soviet Union's expense.

You are bound to wonder: But are we partners? Do people really treat partners like that? Yes, when one of them is weak and unsure of himself. Clearly, Washington has asked itself what kind of benefit it will actually be possible to derive from American-Soviet relations after the START Treaty is signed, when the disarmament theme will have been exhausted for some time to come. "According to administration spokesmen," THE NEW YORK TIMES has stressed, "there will be a break in the arms reduction dialogue which could cloud not just the results of the agreement but also the future of the Soviet Union."

In such a situation, it seemed preferable to Washington to set new conditions for us. It is not my intention to reproach the United States, as its policy has been dictated by a desire to derive specific benefit from specific circumstances and thereby look after its own national interests. No, you cannot really reproach an eagle, such as the one depicted on the U.S. emblem, for being an eagle. Only Bush's oft-repeated words about partnership do not seem in this context to be too sincere, to put it mildly.

Incidentally, it became clear during Bush's visit that the concept of "national interests" is not something abstract for the administration. They have clearly defined and enshrined them—these interests—in relevant documents. George Bush must now revise some of the wording in the interpretation of this concept, as, according to existing laws, "national interests do not permit the granting of government credits to 'Marxist-Leninist states.'" Is it not time for us to establish clear criteria which enable us to approach any international situation from the standpoint of our own national interests? Is it not time for us to look at our burgeoning partnership from precisely that standpoint? I would like to be correctly understood. I do not seek to diminish the importance of the changes taking place in Soviet-American relations. But I can already see the danger of our becoming, as has already happened many times before, enthralled by words and starry-eyed dreams, and of our repeating our talk about partnership and the new era without realizing that the new period of relations with the United States also contains new challenges.

The main challenge is that equitable partnership in today's world is possible between equal partners. To our great regret, we are not such to the United States. Consequently, the Soviet Union will have, wherever suitable, to pursue a policy based on compromises. In order to avoid compromises for the sake of compromises we should right now, like the United States, define clearer and more precise long-term plans and objectives for our foreign policy.

China

Foreign Ministry Lauds Nonproliferation Decision

OW1308155491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1440 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Report by diplomatic correspondent Mikhail Mayorov from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Ministry greatly values China's inclusion in the Nuclear Arms Non-proliferation Treaty. The decision to sign the treaty was announced by the Premier for the CPP [as received] State Council, Li Peng, on Saturday during the official visit of the Japanese PM, Toshiki Kaifu, in Peking.

The department for arms limitation and disarmament in the Soviet Foreign Policy Department considers that China's intentions will help strengthen nuclear arms control. The fact that all 5 members of the UN Security Council have signed is all the more importance now as discussions regarding the treaty's extension will take place in 1995. The USSR supports the treaty's extension and has expressed extreme concern that some countries have tried to undermine the treaty.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry does not regard China's decision as an isolated incident but as yet another step towards attaching greater importance to the Nuclear Arms Non-proliferation Treaty. Other events which play an important role in strengthening the treaty are, according to a Soviet expert on this matter, the inclusion of France and South Africa in the treaty. South Africa's decision also entailed the agreement of the so-called African Frontline States.

According to the Soviet Foreign Ministry it is now necessary to encourage Israel to sign the treaty. This could take place during the prospective Middle East Peace Conference; and might in turn have a moral effect on the Arab nations, who have until now refused to sign the treaty on the grounds that Israel has not signed.

India, according to some experts at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, has a negative attitude towards the treaty on nuclear arms control (see "DP" [Diplomatic Panorama] from August 5 1991). The same sources consider that it is therefore unlikely that China's decision will lead to a change in India's opinion. China's inclusion in the treaty, according to India, will not transform it into a state without nuclear capabilties. India will only stop activities which violate the treaty when serious changes have taken place world-wide in the field of nuclear disarmament.

Commentary Praises Decision

OW1408022891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 0900 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Commentary by station observer Alekseyev from the "Asian Affairs" program]

[Text] At a meeting with Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu in Beijing, Chinese Premier Li Peng said that China, in principle, has agreed to sign the international Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Our station observer Alekseyev writes:

China's decision by China did not come as a surprise. In recent months, Beijing has on more than one occasion indicated China's readiness to promote nuclear nonproliferation. For example, Premier Li Peng mentioned this during a meeting with Secretary General Blix of the International Atomic Energy Agency last April, and Foreign Minister Qian Qichen expressed a similar view during his visit to Japan in June. It is rather natural, therefore, that the Chinese premier has stated that Beijing in principle agrees to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Nevertheless, the significance of the statement should not be underrated.

It is by no means accidental that Li Peng's statement has aroused widespread positive response from around the world. I would now like to mention Washington's response. White House spokesman Fitzwater has made a statement, in which he said: The U.S. Government welcomes China's decision and believes this is a fairly important step. I would also like to point out that Beijing's decision is an inevitable product of the peaceful foreign policy pursued by China over the years. This policy has enhanced the prestige and trust China enjoys internationally. I am referring to Beijing's stand in support of nuclear disarmament. I only want to mention China's support for the Soviet-U.S. treaty on destroying intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and one-third of the offensive strategic weapons.

As for China's nuclear force, as Chinese Premier Li Peng told Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu, China possesses a small number of nuclear weapons for defensive purposes. He also reiterated China's position of not becoming the first country to use nuclear weapons under any circumstance.

Beijing's statement agreeing in principle to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty has special significance today. In view of a fundamental improvement in East-West relations, the possibility of the eruption of a nuclear conflict between the United States and the

Soviet Union or any other nuclear power is diminishing. At the same time, the danger of nuclear technology getting out of control is growing. Baghdad's nuclear (?arsenal) is a clear indication of the danger. Therefore, there is a pressing need to take every measure to continue to strengthen control in this area. I am convinced that China's signing of this treaty will contribute significantly to solving this problem.

Moscow Radio Comments on Kaifu's PRC Visit

OW1008115591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1400 GMT 9 Aug 91

[Nikolayev commentary from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] The first day of Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu's China visit is 10 August. Station commentator Nikolayev gives his own point of view on Sino-Japanese relations:

Undoubtedly, the Sino-Japanese summit is very important not only to the two neighboring countries but also to the situation in that region. As we all know, two years ago Tokyo and its Western partners took sanctions against China, thus demonstrating their feelings about the Tiananmen incident. Japan, however, restored its relations with China earlier than other countries. Japan evidently thinks it is unreasonable to continue implementing its former policy on Beijing.

Many observers say Kaifu's activities in China will proceed under the following circumstances: Tokyo wishes to get China out of its isolated state and serve as a mediator to improve China's relations with the West. In my opinion, the Japanese prime minister's visit to China will cause major industrial countries to change their attitude toward China sooner. Otherwise, on the vast Chinese market they would lag far behind the Japanese competitor. I do not believe it is coincidental that the British prime minister will go to Beijing in September, after the Japanese prime minister's visit. The Sino-Japanese summit will be held at a time when the that region's situation is increasingly improving. We may now assume that leaders of the two countries who can improve the situation in the Asian and Pacific region will suggest new ideas to consolidate the improvement. Before departing for China, Prime Minister Kaifu at least proposed that Japan and China jointly take part in the activities aimed at building a new, just international order and multilateral cooperation system in the Asian and Pacific region. Objectively speaking, this is also in China's interests.

Northeast Asia

Agreement With ROK Reportedly Prepared

OW1308170591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1440 GMT 13 Aug 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Ministry has already drafted a treaty on co-operation with South Korea. The treaty was agreed on during Gorbachev's visit to South Korea in April this year. However, not one Soviet diplomat could confirm the announcement in the Soviet press, by the press-agency RENKHAP, that discussions about the points of the treaty will take place during the coming session of the UN General Assembly.

All the same representatives of the Soviet foreign policy department said they were prepared to discuss the draft treaty. They added that the agreement is essentially similar to agreements recently signed by the USSR with many European countries, ie Germany, Italy, Romania, France and many others. The treaty is based on the new political situation in both Europe and Asia. If South Korea is prepared to accept the treaty in its present form then it would embody the essence of both the Helsinki Agreement and the Paris Charter for a New Europe but in Asia.

Although the signing of an international treaty is a long process the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Far East Department did not exclude the possibility of the treaty being signed before the end of the year.

South's Reaction to New DPRK Initiative Hailed

PM1308160191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Aug 91 First Edition p 5

[S. Tikhomirov report: "Ball Is in Southern Side's Court"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 9 Aug—Bilateral U.S.-South Korean consultations on security questions have ended in Honolulu (Hawaiian Islands). Pyongyang—this may be stated with complete assurance—was an unseen third participant in the meeting.

It was Pyongyang's recent initiative aimed at turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone which, according to the YONHAP agency, was virtually number one on the agenda of the talks.

It is perhaps the first time that a peace proposal by the DPRK has attracted such serious attention from Seoul and Washington. However, the latter is so far not rushing to assume any obligations, especially any which involve withdrawing its nuclear weapons from South Korea. The United States has let it be clearly understood that the question of turning the peninsula into a nuclear-free zone must primarily be discussed between Pyongyang and Seoul.

South Korea reacted extremely promptly to Pyongyang's call and, most importantly, has on the whole responded to it positively. True, provisos were forthcoming, such as, for instance: The North must open up its nuclear facilities for inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency; and the North is not entitled to demand the withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons, since this is a matter for Seoul and Washington only.

I do not think that Pyongyang is conducting itself with defiant discourtesy in insisting on the withdrawal of missiles from the South. Who would want to have nuclear bombs under his nose? But be that as it may, the ball is now in the southern side's court. But after all, in the recent past such initiatives, whether they came from Pyongyang or from Seoul, were "booted" over to the other side with admirable ease. However, times have indeed changed if the two allies have decided to find an appropriate answer to Pyongyang. This is especially opportune on the eve of the fourth round of talks between the prime ministers of the North and South, which is due to begin 27 August.

Nuclear Weapons Removal Welcomed

LD1308104691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 12 Aug 91

[Excerpts] The United States and South Korea have agreed to consider removing tactical nuclear weapons from the Korean peninsula. Seoul papers report this with reference to officials. Vladislav Kozyakov comments and this is what he writes.

The decision was reportedly adopted at bilateral security consultations on the Hawaiian Islands last week. The Seoul paper CHOSEN ILPAO notes when and how the United States will remove nuclear weapons was discussed. The consideration is conditioned on North Korea's consent to an international inspection and its renunciation of nuclear weapons development. This is unlikely to prove an obstacle. Pyongyang and the International Atomic Energy Agency are to sign an agreement on inspections of this kind. Besides, Pyongyang has proposed that a nuclear-free zone be formed on the Korean Peninsula.

What made Washington and Seoul reconsider the positioning of American nuclear weapons in South Korea is the general situation change in the first place. Indeed, more than 30 years have passed since America began bringing nuclear weapons to the south of Korea. Any nuclear program in the north was nonexistent and unheard of at the time. South Korea turned into an American nuclear warehouse in the middle of the cold war. The Soviet-American armed confrontation produced bases in South Korea. Western experts say the United States has more than 1,000 nuclear weapons at these bases, albeit mines and bombs and artillery shells.

Now let us stop to think if there is a necessity to preserve an arsenal that is said to be equivalent to 820 bombs of the kind that was dropped on Hiroshima. What sense does it make for the Americans to have these weapons close to the Soviet Union if the cold war has become a thing of the past and Soviet-American relations are built on cooperation? All the more so Moscow has adopted in Asia, as well as in Europe, a defense sufficiency principle. It has withdrawn troops from Mongolia, reduced hundreds of thousands of troops in the Asian part of the Soviet Union and got rid of some 600 nuclear missiles there under the INF Treaty.

If the Seoul newspapers' reports are confirmed, we can congratulate ourselves on more gains in an important area of international politics. Nuclear arms cuts and efforts to check nuclear weapons proliferation are getting action. [passage omitted]

If America pulled out nuclear weapons from South Korea at this time this would be a step in the right direction.

First Barter Trade Between DPRK, ROK Reviewed

SK0908123191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 0900 GMT 30 Jul 91

[Text] AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE [AFP] called the South Korean freighter (Condor's) sailing an event of historic proportion.

A send-off ceremony attended by South Korean public figures was held at Mokpo for the departure of this freighter.

Station commentator (Aleksey Nikolayev) writes the following:

The important thing about this event is that the South Korean freighter (Condor) was honored to participate directly in the first barter trade between South Korea and the DPRK.

After unloading 5,000 tons of rice in the North Korean port of Najin, this freighter will carry tens of thousands of tons of coal and cement on its return voyage.

It is the national division and an acute military and ideological confrontation on the Korean peninsula that has kept North and South Korea from engaging in direct bilateral trade.

Although it is weak, there is a sign of changes in the mutual relations between the DPRK and South Korea. The agreement signed in (?April) on direct barter trade for exchanging rice for coal and cement is a case in point.

Many observers believe that this will serve as the first step in large-scale trade and economic cooperation between the two Korean states.

The South Korean side has vast (?potential) in this field. Not only is Seoul willing to trade directly with the DPRK, but it also hopes to (?invest in North Korea).

Seoul is now in the process of working out a general plan for economic cooperation with the DPRK. In this plan South Korea envisions direct investment in the DPRK economy, a restoration of (?border guard posts) between the South and North, joint development of [word indistinct], and the establishment of a free economic zone on North Korean territory.

According to an AFP report from Pyongyang a few days ago, the DPRK is expected to create a special economic zone in the port of Chongjin and has called on South Korean businessmen to invest in it.

The two sides are expected to discuss this issue at the government-to-government talks between the DPRK and South Korea scheduled for the end of August.

The two sides have just taken a first step toward making direct trade possible. The Mokpo-Najin sea route can truly be regarded as an event of historical proportion.

Southeast Asia

Commentary Views Normalized PRC-SRV Relations

OW1308110091 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 2200 GMT 12 Aug 91

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] China and Vietnam reached an agreement in principle on the normalization of relations between the two countries. This was the major result of negotiations in Beijing between the foreign ministers [as heard] of the two countries. Nikolayev, an observer for this station, has the following comments on the matter:

The estrangement, for more than 10 years, between the two neighboring countries of China and Vietnam has finally ended. Today, it might not be necessary to look back at the apparent reasons that led to the break-up of relations between the two countries in the 1970's and 1980's. I think we should follow the principle that has played an effective role in normalizing Soviet-Chinese relations, that is, ending the past and looking ahead to the future. I think it should be pointed out that it was the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations that, to a certain extent, sped up the total normalization of Vietnamese-Chinese relations. Of course, positive progress in settling conflicts in Cambodia also greatly contributed to normalizing relations between Vietnam and China. As everyone knows, lately the problems in Cambodia were the major obstacle to negotiations between Hanoi and Beijing. Obviously, the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia in September 1989 was a turning point. Beijing was skeptical about the fact that Vietnam had completely withdrawn its troops from Cambodia; however, later it gradually dropped its allegation that Vietnamese troops still remained in Cambodia.

Hanoi welcomed China's constructive stand on coming to a political settlement concerning the Cambodian issue. Vietnam highly praised a meeting on the Cambodian issue that was recently held in Beijing. Negotiations on this issue at the meeting between the vice foreign ministers of the two countries are an important part of international efforts to end conflicts in Cambodia. Of course, some problems—including the territorial problem—between the two countries still remain to be solved. Experience in solving territorial problems between China and its neighbors, like the Soviet Union and India, shows that it will be easier to solve these problems by including them in efforts to normalize relations between the countries. We hope that the agreement in principle on the normalization of relations between Vietnam and China will serve as a catalyst for restoring and developing traditional neighborly relations and cooperation between the two countries.

Pavlov Congratulates New SRV Premier

LD1308115191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1100 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] USSR Prime Minister Pavlov has sent a telegram to Vo Van Kiet congratulating him on his election as Council of Ministers chairman of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. He expressed confidence that the relations of friendship and cooperation between our countries would continue to strengthen and develop in the future.

Shenin Receives Departing SRV Ambassador

PM1408095191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Aug 91 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under "Official Reports" rubric]

[Text] On 9 August O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Nguyen Manh Cam, SRV ambassador to the USSR, in connection with his forthcoming departure for his homeland.

In the course of a friendly conversation a frank exchange of opinions took place on questions of interest to both sides, on the search for new forms of party relations between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Vietnam, and on increasing their effectiveness.

Commentary Views Improved Sino-Indonesian Ties

OW1108104991 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1400 GMT 10 Aug 91

[Viktorov commentary; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] A new rule has been put into effect in Indonesia; that is, Indonesian citizens are allowed to visit China freely. Our station's observer Viktorov has written the following commentary regarding this:

Indonesian State Secretary Moerdiono said at a press conference that the new rule is aimed primarily at further expanding economic and trade ties and bilateral relations. Many journalists view this as another step in carrying out the agreements reached between Indonesia and China following the restoration of their diplomatic ties in 1990.

Dear listeners, the bilateral agreement was reached in various fields at that time as a result of an exchange of visits by high-level delegations from the two sides. Now, some of the agreements have been put into practice; others are still under careful study. For example, the two countries have restored most-favored-nation treatment to each other in bilateral trade relations, and have dealt with Indonesia's longstanding debt to China in the amount of some $80 million. Recently, China and Indonesia established direct air service links. Three Indonesian airlines are now operating scheduled flights to Beijing, Shanghai, and Guangzhou, while Chinese passenger airplanes are serving quite a lot of passengers at airports in Jakarta and Surabaya. In addition, the two countries will carry out a host of large-scale joint economic plans, including plans for mineral prospecting and space research.

As pointed out by industrialists and businessmen from both countries, the joint Sino-Indonesian plans are based on mutually beneficial bilateral cooperation and are much more economical than similar plans they would otherwise carry out with Western countries. Experts say that there are good prospects for the two countries to develop such cooperation.

It has taken almost 25 years for Indonesia and China to overcome the obstacles caused by their demands on and distrust of each other and to restore their natural [zi ran; as heard] cooperation based on mutual benefit. The appearance of such a good thing at this time, I believe, is another indication that a favorable turn has occurred in the world situation, and that the international atmosphere of the vast Asia-Pacific region has further improved.

Near East & South Asia

Kozyrev on Problem of POW's in Afghanistan

LD1308181191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Network in Russian 1530 GMT 13 Aug 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The last units of Soviet troops left Afghanistan almost two years ago. But the war has not finished yet, first and foremost, for mothers of soldiers who are still being held as prisoners of war. One more Soviet citizen—a 25 year-old Kurban, Ali Tamrifov [as heard]—was freed yesterday. He was handed over in Islamabad to ambassador at large Nikolay Kozyrev, who is currently in Pakistan taking part in the talks on the settlement of the Afghan situation.

[Begin recording] [correspondent R. Zaynetdinov] What are the main vexed areas, the main problems of the talks?

[Kozyrev] The main vexed area of the talks is the very transitional period itself, namely what it should consist of and what kind of mechanism it should have, and whether there should be some kind of temporary transitional government or just a body dealing with organizing the elections, as well as the issue as to what kind of transformation the present political structures in Afghanistan should undergo.

[Zaynetdinov] What will be the solution for the problem of the Soviet POWs who are still... in the hands of the opposition?

[Kozyrev] The problem of Soviet POWs is a very complex problem. We have been dealing with it for 12 years already, in fact, since the beginning of this conflict, since the time when our boys were captured. This work was stepped up after the withdrawal of Soviet troops and this process has picked up speed since then. Well, so far the situation leaves much to be desired since the mojahedin are unwilling to hand back our boys for a whole number of reasons and they think that it is necessary to present political conditions. The main point is that apart from this they demand a large number of mojahedin POWs in return. For example, they demanded that 25 mojahedin be released in return for Comrade Tashrifov [as heard] who was set free yesterday and handed over to us in Islamabad. By the way they are in the hands of the Kabul government, and not in our hands. Strictly speaking it was the goodwill of Najibollah that helped to rescue our POWs. He feels well. He is touched, of course, very much by everything that happened. Today he is to meet his father who arrived yesterday. Today he will embrace his son in Islamabad and they are to return home on 17 August. [video shows interview with Kozyrev] [end recording]

Border Violations by Afghan Air Force Reported

PM1308095391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Aug 91 p 2

[A. Bushev report: "Gloomy 'Spirits' on the Border"]

[Text] Turkmenia—We still do not know the final results of the investigation into the case of the recent bombing of a Tajik border village. The central newspapers have put forward a number of different stories about what happened, whereas the military has stated unequivocally: The bombs dropped on the civilian settlement were the work of Afghan Air Force pilots. As is known, an official apology from Najibullah has been published.

In the past few days, DZERZHINETS, the organ of the Central Asian Border District, published statistics according to which the following conclusion begs to be made: Afghan military pilots visit the Soviet sky without permission far more frequently than we would like. The newspaper cites an official document: "In just six months (of this year—A.B.) Afghan Air Force aircraft and helicopters committed 47 violations of the border of the USSR's airspace."

According to border guards' testimony there are days when up to six Afghan Air Force machines fly into Soviet territory.

"We registered 108 violations between 1 and 20 July," I. Belskiy, an officer from a Termez border detachment, testified. "But the day before yesterday... an Afghan helicopter circled above the border watchtower on the post's territory, then flew a small distance away from it and started rocketing its own territory. We were perplexed."

If a slight error had been made, as the border newspaper justly observes on this subject, the rockets would have fallen straight on our kolkhoz [collective farm] livestock unit near the border, with its animals and kolkhoz workers. Again blood should have been shed.

There have even been cases when Afghan pilots landed at Soviet border airports, having "forgotten" to warn our air traffic controllers.

"If they do not have this information, the border details and air defense troops might assess these flights as hostile and take the appropriate measures," DZERZHINETS comments on the incidents in question.

Paper on U.S. Plans for Further Strikes in Iraq

PM1308160091 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by Major General A. Ivanov: "New Storm Over Iraq"]

[Text] It is now five months since the end of the war in the Persian Gulf, but complete stabilization of the military-political situation in that region is still far off. Recent events which have developed surrounding Iraq confirm this. The U.S. Administration has accused the Iraqi leadership of not furnishing the UN observers with full information about its nuclear potential and has issued a threat to carry out fresh strikes on a number of Iraqi installations which form the basis of its military-industrial and military potential.

According to news agency reports, the U.S. President has endorsed the proposals submitted to him by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Iraqi facilities which should be destroyed in the first instance. Such facilities could include nuclear research laboratories and centers, sites where nuclear materials and chemical weapons are produced and stockpiled, plants where surface-to-surface missiles are assembled and other kinds of weapons produced, major electric power stations, petroleum refineries, strategic communication lines and engineering structures located on them, facilities of the Iraqi supreme state and military command, and so forth.

Judging by the experience of action of the multinational forces during Operation Desert Storm and the current composition of the group of American troops in the Persian Gulf, the military action being planned against Iraq by the U.S. Armed Forces command could be an air operation which is relatively short in duration but large-scale in terms of the composition and potential of the forces and resources involved. Such an operation will employ all U.S. combat aviation and conventionally armed sea-launched Tomahawk cruise missiles available in the region. The involvement of American special operations subunits in this action is not ruled out either. The U.S. Air Force and Navy forces in the region include about 250 combat planes of various types and around 10 ships carrying Tomahawk cruise missiles.

According to current reports, the Pentagon intends to reinforce the existing Air Force group in the Persian Gulf zone by transferring extra combat planes there from the United States and West Europe. These include F-117A tactical fighters, which acquitted themselves well during Operation Desert Storm and whose "stealth" technology enables them to penetrate an enemy's air defense system undetected.

Britain and France, which are already ready to send aviation subunits of theirs to Turkish territory, have stated their support for the U.S. Administration's intention to resume air strikes on Iraq.

As far as the possible timetable for carrying out fresh military action against Iraq and the likelihood of it are concerned, this clearly depends primarily on how the Baghdad authorities behave and also on the overall military-political situation in the region, including the attitude of other countries to American intentions. In any event, the final deadline for Baghdad to furnish the United Nations with all the required information was set for 25 July 1991.

The Iraqi side did give fresh information about its nuclear potential within the time set, and from that moment on specialists from the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] and UN experts began the work of studying and verifying it in Iraq. However, the Americans, who would like, by all appearances, to carry out their planned action, continue to question Baghdad's sincerity and seek to make other charges against Saddam Husayn and his entourage.

The fuss recently created by the United States and its allies over the question of Iraq's incomplete fulfillment of UN Security Council Resolution 687 has its own rationale. The point is not only or not mainly that Iraq has not rushed to reveal all its military secrets and has engaged, it is believed, in the development of nuclear weapons. Many U.S. allies in the region, notably Israel and Pakistan, which no one is planning to bomb yet, are very successfully engaged in such work. No, the point, rather, lies elsewhere.

Having halted combat operations on 28 February after liberating Kuwait and crushing the southern group of Iraqi troops, the U.S. Administration seems to have expected that Saddam Husayn's regime would fall either under the pressure of antigovernment actions by the Kurds and Shiites or would at least be so weakened that it would agree unconditionally to meet all UN demands and would not pose any threat whatsoever to American interests. However, the development of events in Iraq has proceeded according to a different scenario.

Declaring his defeat a victory, Saddam Husayn adopted pretty harsh measures to suppress the armed actions of the opposition in the south and north of the country, began implementing large-scale measures to restore the Army's combat capability, and carried out major changes in the leadership of the country and the Armed Forces to enhance the effectiveness of command. Work to restore the activity of defense-complex enterprises has started. It has emerged during the work of UN observers in Iraq engaged in monitoring the fulfillment of relevant Security Council resolutions that the Americans and their allies in the anti-Iraq coalition failed during Operation Desert Storm to completely destroy Iraq's military-economic potential and to thus deprive it of the potential to restore its military might in the future. It turns out in fact that the main aim of the war against Iraq—removing it from the military-political arena of the Near East as the main threat to the security of America's allies and U.S. interests in the region—was not achieved.

It is easy to understand that all this does reduce for the Bush administration the value of the military victory over Iraq and forces the United States to seek ways to continue exerting strong-arm pressure on Saddam Husayn's regime in order that this war aim be eventually realized. Otherwise, the political rivals of the present administration could exploit the current situation for their own interests. A new military success by the administration and uncompromising and resolute action taken by it could, however, work to enhance its prestige, which is not unimportant in the run-up to the U.S. presidential campaign.

This, it seems to me, supplies the basic rationale for the new threats against Iraq by the United States and its allies and the practical preparations for their implementation. They are pretty serious, and the Bush administration could decide to resume combat operations against Iraq, particularly if the latest responses by the Iraqi side to questions about its nuclear program do not satisfy the United Nations and the Americans.

Cooperation Memorandum Signed With Iran on Visas

PM1408101791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Aug 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 7 August, a memorandum on cooperation on consular issues was signed by the USSR Government and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. In accordance with the memorandum, there is provision for a significant simplification of procedures involved in issuing visas and also a reduction in the time required for the examination of visa applications.

The memorandum was signed on the Soviet side by B.N. Chaplin, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, and on the Iranian side by Mojtaba Mir-Mehdi, Iranian deputy minister of foreign affairs.

Mojtaba Mir-Mehdi was received by Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs.

Commentary Denounces Government-Backed Terrorism

NC1308130391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Persian to Iran 1430 GMT 12 Aug 91

[Text] Dear listeners: Our commentator Aleksandr Pogodin writes on the release last week of three individuals—British, French and American citizens—in Lebanon who had been held hostage by extremist groups. Probably the deep satisfaction over the release of innocent people and the desire to join in the joy of their family members can be considered the first and most natural reaction to this event.

Meanwhile, those who made efforts to have them released should also be paid due respect. Among them, of course, are the United Nations and Javier Perez de Cuellar, its secretary general. Citing George Bush's statement issued yesterday, Syria, Lebanon, and Iran have also played an active role in assisting in this humanitarian endeavor. This incident makes it necessary to speak of the political aspect of the matter.

U.S. observers stress the point that until a year ago, any kind of positive comment by Washington regarding Syria or Iran—the irreconcilable and longstanding opponents of the United States—was absolutely impossible. Now, as you can see, the situation is changing. In my opinion, this is due to the general trend of events in the Middle East atmosphere, which are positive and definite. An example is Syria's recent positive reaction to the proposed Middle East peace conference on resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict, which is one of the factors that will bring peace closer to this region.

According to publications, Syria and Lebanon have taken effective steps for the release of the hostages. Tehran, as well, has utilized its resources to exert influence on the groups over which it has some clout. Naturally, all of these have generated some hope, but there is much yet to be done to complete this task. This matter inevitably brings home the need to wipe out terrorism, among the manifestations of which are abduction and hostage-taking.

This further highlights the need for abolishing government-sponsored terrorism that is committed not by individual groups, but by governments. For example, at present, approximately 400 Lebanese are languishing in Israeli dungeons, most of whom have been abducted by Israeli commando groups from Lebanese soil.

In conclusion, Aleksandr Pogodin writes: I dearly wish to be optimistic, now that the chance of resolving this issue has become more tangible, that the Israeli Government will display some goodwill and play its part in restoring peace to the region.

Gorbachev, Indian Leaders Exchange Congratulations

PM0908141991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Cables"]

[Text] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev sent Indian President R. Venkatamaran and Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao the following cable:

"On behalf of the Soviet people, I send you and the Indian people congratulations on the 20th anniversary of the USSR-Indian Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation.

"This is a long time in our stormy, changeable times to check the durability of the principles and good intentions toward one another enshrined in this treaty.

"It has been the legal foundation and one of the reliable supports for the stable development of Soviet-Indian relations, which, particularly over the last five years, have attained a new level of trust, harmony, and real cooperation.

"The continuity between the treaty and the 1986 Delhi Declaration—an outstanding document of our times—is obvious. It reflects the political, humanitarian, and spiritual essence of relations between two great peoples. Its ideas continue to live on and operate in the interests of the entire world community.

"Let me convey my best wishes to the friendly Indian people. I wish you, Esteemed Mr. President and Mr. Prime Minister, health and success in your great undertakings and work."

For their part, India's president and prime minister sent congratulatory cables to the USSR president. These cables particularly stressed the abiding significance of the treaty for the onward development of the multifaceted friendly Soviet-Indian relations that have made a weighty contribution to the cause of peace and stability throughout the world and facilitated the international disarmament process. They expressed profound satisfaction at the decision adopted by our two countries' governments to extend the treaty for a further 20 years. On behalf of the government and people of India they voiced wishes for the Soviet people's happiness and prosperity.

'Arafat Reaffirms Support for Peace Initiatives

PM1408104091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Aug 91 First Edition p 4

[Report on interview with PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat by IAN correspondent I. Menshikov in Tunis; date not given: "Y. 'Arafat: Just Solution Necessary"]

[Text] Tunis—The peace process in the Near East is gathering pace. The main Arab countries and Israel have already agreed in principle to participate in a future peace conference. The recent Soviet-U.S. statement defined a possible date for convening it—October. In these conditions, the utmost attention is being paid now to the Palestinians' position. This position is expounded in an exclusive interview for PRAVDA given to IAN correspondent I. Menshikov in the capital of Tunisia by PLO Leader Yasir 'Arafat.

Y. 'Arafat stated that the PLO welcomes the joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the Near East that opens the way for a peace process based on international law, including ensuring the rights of the Palestinian people. These rights are inextricably linked with the implementation of the corresponding UN resolutions. We very much hope that President G. Bush's appeal to conclude "peace in exchange for land" and repeated Soviet proposals on a just and comprehensive solution to the conflict in the region will be realized.

On the subject of Palestinian participation in the upcoming conference, Y. 'Arafat stated that there is no historical precedent whereby one side's delegation must be approved by the opposing side. Only the Palestinians are being denied the right to name their own representatives for the peace talks. Israel says "no" to an independent Palestinian delegation, thereby denying the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination. In practice, this signifies an intention to continue the occupation and colonization of Palestinian lands, under the cover of offering inhabitants of the occupied territories a limited autonomy.

We refuse to obey the Israeli diktat, the PLO leader said, stating that a decision on the question of representation comes exclusively under the competence of the Palestinian leadership. It alone has the right to decide whether the Palestinians will be represented by a separate, all-Arab, or Jordanian-Palestinian delegation.

Y. 'Arafat appealed to the Soviet Union as co-initiator of the peace conference to do everything possible to remove the "veto" imposed by Israel on the Palestinian representation.

Speaking at a press conference recently, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker advised the Palestinians to opt for peace despite the many differences of opinion, pointing out that they stand to gain more than anybody if a peace process begins in the Near East and to lose out if it does not get off the ground. In this connection, Y. 'Arafat recalled that the Palestinians submitted their own peace initiative as far back as 1988. They subsequently approved the famous Egyptian-U.S. 10-point peace proposals and later supported U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's five-point plan. As we know, all of these peace initiatives were rejected one after the other by Israel. Thus, it would be more logical to send "advice on peace" to the Israeli Government, which is trying to avoid a just and comprehensive solution by continually imposing new conditions.

There is no doubt, Y. 'Arafat said in conclusion, that the Soviet Union's presence as cochairman of the conference represents, from our point of view, a vital safeguard upon which we rely, remembering the traditional friendship between the peoples of Palestine and the Soviet Union. The proposed comprehensive and just solution for the region must take due account not only of Arab-Israeli relations but also of the interests of the Palestinian people.

West Europe

PRAVDA Views Soviet-Finnish Trade Prospects

PM1308131391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Aug 91 Second Edition p 5

[Editorial Office commentary: "After Kostomuksha"]

[Text] Even before Soviet Prime Minister V. Pavlov met Finland's Prime Minister Esko Aho in Kostomuksha, opinions were being expressed that the time was just right for such a meeting and for talks on specific aspects of economic cooperation between our countries. It is well known that many Finnish firms and enterprises consider the revival of Soviet-Finnish trade—which is currently experiencing considerable difficulties—a very important matter, while some consider it vitally necessary. After all, a whole series of Finnish firms that were geared to trade with our country are, to put it mildly, in a highly complex position, while some have simply gone bankrupt because of difficulties with our payments which developed in the last few years, confusion in our economic offices and departments, and hastily adopted decisions on the principles and forms of payment for reciprocal deliveries—especially the abolition of the clearing system which played a considerable role in boosting mutually advantageous trade turnover and economic cooperation in general between our countries.

The Kostomuksha meeting was positively appraised both in the USSR and in Finland. While still in Kostomuksha, Finland's prime minister expressed satisfaction with the outcome of the talks. On his return home he declared that the Soviet Government's decision to allow barter trade will be a significant incentive for bilateral trade and economic relations between the two countries, which have been declining recently.

E. Aho expressed confidence that the solution of the problem will be facilitated by the new structure of the Soviet part of the bilateral intergovernmental commission on trade and economic cooperation. The representation of union republics on it promises to make contacts between the countries broader and more effective.

Does this mean that the economic turnover between the neighboring states, which had almost ended up in a blind alley, has been restored along firm tracks? It is evidently too early to speak of this. Let us take a look at what Finland's mass media say about it. HELSINGIN SANOMAT, for example, writes that the USSR Government's decision to allow again barter trade between Finnish and Soviet enterprises is not at all surprising for major Finnish firms. "They," in the newspaper's opinion, "attach greater importance to the decision to be made by the Russian Republic, since Finland imports the bulk of raw materials it needs from Russia, with which talks are constantly and fruitfully conducted."

People in Finland believe that, taking into account the state in which the USSR finds itself today, no trade partner can be guaranteed stable business contacts and a place in the market. The effect of the decline of "Eastern trade" on the difficulties Finland is currently experiencing is broader than it might appear at first glance. This effect goes further than the bankruptcy of firms specializing in trade with the USSR. Cause-and-effect links are profoundly affecting all aspects of the country's economic life.

It is obvious that, as Soviet reforms in the economic sphere are implemented, the Soviet and Finnish business circles' reciprocal interest is growing. It is also obvious that now it is necessary to create—without any superfluous red tape—a cooperation mechanism in line with the present transition period. This is why one cannot but agree with Finland's prime minister that the work of the Soviet-Finnish Mixed Commission for Trade and Economic Cooperation must be reviewed in terms of content and organization. It seems that appropriate amendments must be introduced in tax legislation and taxation practice regarding levies on commodity turnover within the framework of border ties.

Is it possible to return to the old system of our business ties, with barter ties being predominant? The Soviet premier was asked about this by Finnish journalists. A return to the old in the new conditions is simply impossible, he correctly believes.

A few days ago we reprinted an interesting report from a Finnish newspaper. It said that, for the first time in the history of Soviet-Finnish economic relations, Finland is purchasing a consignment of self-propelled artillery mounts for Finland's defense forces worth a total of 260 million markkas. This sum will be put to the following use in Finland: 100 million markkas of the amount earned from Soviet deliveries will be allocated to repay the debt outstanding since the end of the period of clearing trade between Finland and the USSR, and the remaining 160 million will be used to purchase various goods in Finland.

It looks as if this deal—obviously to both sides' advantage—will be the precursor of a revival in Soviet-Finnish trade and economic relations, which have experienced better times than at present.

Finland Ready To Subsidize Ecological Action

OW1308131291 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1140 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to the Leningrad Soviet's ecological commission the Finnish Government is prepared to provide funds for environmental protection in Estonia, Leningrad and Karelia. The amount of money involved this year could even amount to 45 million Finnish marks.

In addition 37 million roubles from the Russian budget have been allocated to the up-keep of the Leningrad Dam in the Finnish Gulf, although completion of its construction is still uncertain.

BND Deputy on Kryuchkov's Information Offer

PM1308142591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Aug 91 Second Edition p 7

[Unidentified correspondent's report: "Cooperation Is Possible"]

[Text] Berlin, 11 Aug—The SAT-1 television channel recently carried an interview with USSR KGB Chairman V. Kryuchkov. In it he offered his Western counterparts a regular exchange of information of mutual interest.

This proposals has not gone unnoticed in Germany. According to Paul Muenstermann, deputy chief of the Bundesnachrichtendienst [BND], the German intelligence service, his department can perfectly well imagine such cooperation. The BND and KGB could, in certain fashion, coordinate their activities in the sphere of combating international terrorism, the drugs trade, and smuggling. P. Muenstermann also noted that so far the BND has not been officially approached by the KGB but any request will be most thoroughly studied as soon as this happens.

INTERFAX Assesses Collapse of Berlin Wall

OW1408025491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1440 GMT 14 Aug 91

[By Andrey Kortunov, political analyst: "In Shadow of the Berlin Wall's Remains;" from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Today is the 30th anniversary of the Berlin wall's construction. The wall was a symbol of Germany's national and personal tragedies, an embodiment of the Germany's decreased status in post-war politics. For Europeans the Wall has become a material, ferro-concrete incarnation of "the iron curtain" which partitioned Europe from the Baltics to the Black sea and broke economic, political, cultural and spiritual relations between East and West. For the Soviet people, at any rate for those of them who are used to thinking, the Wall has become a formidable symptom of the crisis of socialism which had to resort to such an odious form of educating its citizens.

Today the remains of the Berlin wall are not more than a tourist sight of the united Germany's capital, and they are a new source of souvenirs for tourists like the Cheops pyramid and the Acropolis in Athens. Residents of other cities partitioned with barbed wire, walls and military and political posts—Ulster, Nicosia and Beirut—are entitled to envy the happy Berliners.

But it seems to me that it is not yet time to speak about the final collapse of the Berlin wall. The Wall is not only iron plates but also profound differences in psychology, political culture and ethics between the Ossies and the Wessies, between Eastern and Western Europe. I am not touching only upon the abyss in economy and technology, different standards of living and social contrasts.

Will the Europeans be able to manage to break down that wall, to restore the former unity of the continent? If they are, how much time will it take?

I have no doubt that the wall between the east and the west of Germany will be broken down quickly enough. The historic unity of the Germans plus hundreds of billions of Marks will do the job. But it would be much more difficult to repeat that on a European scale. Flourishing, liberal and cosmopolitan Western Europeans expose from time to time their unwillingness to lionize backward, radical-minded and impatient partners in the East. There are appeals not to let the newly-converted democrats into Europe—by means of customs tariffs, strict emigration quotas and speeding up their own integration processes. If such views dominate, the Soviet experience of intensive erection of fortified constructions may be successfully used by eurocrats in Brussels and Strasbourg.

UK To Help Establish Foreign Investment Bank

LD1408104591 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Report by TASS correspondent Dmitriy Voskoboynikov]

[Text] London August 14 TASS—The British Government has announced the allocation of 450,000 pounds to help the Soviet Union to establish a bank to attract foreign investments.

This financial assistance from the British know-how fund for the USSR is the first project approved after the fund was increased up to 50 million pounds sterling following President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to London in July.

According to a Foreign Office official, the fund money will be used to finance plausibility research for the future Soviet bank.

The research will be conducted by many firms and banks in conjunction, including the London-based financial consulting firm Arthur Andersen and the Morgan Grenfell commercial bank.

As a result of this work, experts hope to draw up a plan of action for the bank to facilitate the attraction of foreign investments in the USSR, as well as to supply recommendations on technical assistance required before the new Soviet bank begins to function.

The FINANCIAL TIMES notes that the British Government announcement followed on the heels of chancellor of the exchequer Norman Lamont's visit to the Soviet Union.

Political & Social

Pavlov Says Union Treaty To Change Economy

OW1308200491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov has said that when the treaty of the Union is signed, the structure of economic management will change. Speaking in an exclusive interview to IF [INTERFAX] on Tuesday Pavlov said that the Union will consist not only of permanent members, to which he referred as the "nucleus," but also associate members. This will change the functions of executive government.

Pavlov said the reorganization of government would require a transitional period. "When the Union treaty has been signed, neither legislative nor executive bodies at the Union and republican levels will be able to exist in their present shape", Pavlov said.

Valentin Pavlov did not elaborate on the functions a future Cabinet of Ministers would have. He said he hadn't seen yet the final version of the treaty of the Union that would be open for signature as of August 20.

In an answer to one of the question Pavlov said he was firmly against allowing foreigners to invest roubles they acquire at the market exchange rate into the Soviet economy or selling their products in the USSR at free prices.

"As long I am in office, I will not let this happen", the Soviet Prime Minister said. "I have nothing against dollar investments, but the investment of roubles earned in this way must be ruled out".

Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's interview will be available in full in the upcoming edition of NATION AND SOCIETY.

MOSCOW NEWS Publishes Text of Union Treaty

LD1408091291 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 14 TASS—The Soviet independent weekly MOSCOW NEWS today published the text of the Union treaty which is to be open for the signing on August 20.

As is known, the document was coordinated by leaders of nine Union republics and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev at a conference in Novo-Ogarevo on July 23.

Under the document, the acronym "USSR" will stand for "the Union of Soviet Sovereign Republics".

The document says that the USSR is "A sovereign federal democratic state formed as a result of union of equal republics and exercising state authority within the limit of powers voluntarily given to it by the parties to the treaty".

The document says that the states forming the Union "enter it directly or in the composition of other states. They enjoy full political authority and independently decide of their national-state and administrative-territorial structure and the system of government bodies". They can delegate part of their powers to other states, parties to the treaty, in which they are included.

The legislative power of the Union is exercised by bicameral Supreme Council, consisting of the Council of Republics (previously Council of Nationalities) and the Council of the Union. Head of the Union state is president of the Union who has the supreme executive and administrative power.

According to the treaty, he is elected by citizens of the Union on the basis of universal suffrage, equal and direct secret ballot for a term of five years and not more than for two terms in succession. The Union's Cabinet of Ministers is an organ of executive power of the Union subjugated to the president of the Union and accountable to the Supreme Soviet.

With the treaty taking effect, the preferential treatment is applied to the states that are parties to the treaty. Relations between the Union of Soviet Sovereign Republics and of the republics incorporated in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that have not signed the treaty are to be regulated on the basis of the Union's laws and mutual obligations and agreements.

The document says that the Union is open to other democratic states recognising the treaty.

Yanayev, Meskhetian Turks Discuss Homeland Return

PM1308154391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by G. Shipitko: "Yanayev Received Meskhetian Turks"]

[Text] A meeting took place 8 August in the Kremlin between USSR Vice President G.I. Yanayev and representatives of the Meskhetian-Turk people. The reason was the picketing by Meskhetian Turks—who are demanding an immediate decision on their return to Georgia—outside the Manezh building and the Supreme Soviet lobby.

As is known, the Turks were unlawfully deported to Central Asia in 1944. As a result of interethnic strife in June 1989 they were sent to various areas of the country, but even now, two years later, they are still in the position of refugees. A USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium commission formed right after the events in Fergana was given the basic task of returning the Turks to their historic homeland—the southern areas of Georgia. However, because of the tough stance of both former and present Georgian Governments, the people cannot go back to their motherland.

"Recourse to force—still less, extremist methods—will not bring the solution of the problem any closer," the vice president stressed. "You must realize that the country's leadership honestly desires that the problem be resolved by means of accord and mutual dialogue with a sovereign state such as Georgia."

G.I. Yanayev then dwelt in detail on the steps that the USSR Supreme Soviet and the country's government are taking. In March of this year a resolution was adopted on repealing legislative acts concerning peoples who were subjected to forced resettlement. In July the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities appealed to the Georgian president and Supreme Soviet to examine the question of returning the Meskhetian Turks to their historic homeland. And if the Georgian leadership has the political will, then the problem can be resolved, the USSR vice president stressed. And we will contact Georgia in the near future and we hope to start holding talks with the participation of representatives of your people. I myself am prepared to become involved in solving this problem, the vice president assured his audience.

Questions of improving social and material provision for people in places of temporary residence were also examined at the meeting. It was noted in particular that in a number of oblasts, and particularly in Krasnodar Kray, they have been deprived of elementary assistance from the local authorities. No temporary residence permits are drawn up for them, they are not given pension documents, and no subsidies and compensation in connection with the price rises are issued to them even for their children.

The necessary decisions will be taken jointly with the Russian Government in order to improve the social position of these refugees in the places of their temporary residence, USSR Vice President G.I. Yanayev said when concluding the meeting.

The picketing ended 9 August.

'Islamic Factor' Conference To Be Held 22-26 Aug

LD1308112691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1000 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] From 22 to 26 August inclusive for the first time in the Soviet Union a forum of Muslim public organizations—the Islamic Factor in the East European Processes—will be held. Taking part in this event will be Muslim religious and public figures, businessmen and diplomats from 12 countries. In the framework of the forum roundtables will be held on problems of the Muslim youth movement, Muslim social movements in eastern Europe, and questions of a single information system of Muslims.

TASS Reports 'Result' of Vnukovo Pilots Strike

LD1308164291 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow August 13 TASS— Pilot Oleg Solovev headed the Vnukovo state-owned Avia Amalgamation, replacing Aleksey Timofeyev, who has been given the vote of non-confidence by the work collective. This is a result of last Saturday's 12-hour long strike of pilots of the Vnukovo airport, one of the biggest in the USSR.

The minister of civil aviation has been convinced by the reasoning of the organisers of the strike who accused the former chief of the amalgamation of unwillingness to establish business contacts with pilots and to take steps to improve their living and working conditions.

The other consequence of the strike is that a conciliatory commission has been formed of representatives of the administration and the independent union of pilots at Vnukovo. The commission began working [in] Moscow. It is to draft a collective agreement containing obligations to satisfy pilots' social and economic demands. It will cost at least 10 million roubles to satisfy these demands. "Vnukovo should go under Russian jurisdiction and should become a joint stock society. This is how our financial difficulties can be solved", said Yuriy Bulanov, head of pilots union at Vnukovo.

PRAVDA Commentary on Draft CPSU Program

PM1308150291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial commentary, accompanied by quotation from the draft CPSU Program: "For Realism in Political Activity"]

[Text] "Placing the interests of working people in the forefront, the CPSU today is the party of social progress and democratic reforms, the party of social justice and panhuman values, the party of economic, political, and spiritual freedom." (From the draft CPSU Program)

Yesterday, PRAVDA published the draft of the new CPSU Program, which has been issued for partywide discussion.

No doubt all Communists will study and analyze it with profound interest and define their own attitude toward the program principles and party aims and tasks it expounds. The party document, which defines in a new way and from a realistic standpoint the basic directions for the CPSU's activity in the 1990's and the paths for its radical renewal, is intended for realistic, constructive discussion.

It is generally recognized that the range of opinions, views on the prospects for developing society, evaluations of the past and present, and ways out of the country's current crisis is extremely broad. This is reflected in the various currents within the party itself, and in the various political forces' clashes of position on literally all topical problems. The new program, which in the course of the partywide discussion will absorb a wealth of thoughts, experiences, and analyses of contemporary realities, must become the ideological basis for consolidating communists and all supporters of socialist choice.

The party is counting on the general public's active participation too. The party is appealing to all who hold dear the fate of the Fatherland, civil peace, and the well-being of the peoples of the Soviet Union. This is not a tribute to tradition, to a time of importunate assertions: "The party's plans are the people's plans," "Party and people are united." It is a true reflection of the CPSU's openness toward society and its efforts to elaborate and realize a policy close to and understood by the people, inspiring their trust and support.

Among the main principles by which the party's political activity will be guided are the interests of all-around social progress. Moreover, the CPSU believes that progress is secured precisely through reforms, the potential of which is demonstrated by the experience of contemporary world development. No political organization is entitled to effect a forcible restructuring of society—this conclusion, like other principles formulated in the draft, is the result of the party's having rethought the path already traversed and analyzed the new historical situation.

Humanism and panhuman values; democracy and freedom in all its manifestations, which is inseparable from civil responsibility; social justice, patriotism and internationalism, the interests of integrating our country into the world community.... Today, these ideas are the focus of public attention, and by promoting them as the basic principles of its activity the CPSU strives to express the people's aspirations and reinforce the positive changes achieved in the country's development in the perestroyka years. It can be hoped that the discussion of the draft program during preparation for the extraordinary 29th CPSU Congress will not just assist the elaboration of common approaches toward the proclaimed principles, but also their implementation in the party's practical work.

It is impossible to find true answers to fundamental questions of the day or make realistic predictions for the future without an honest, unbiased evaluation of the past. The CPSU—and this is clearly expressed in the draft program—does not idealize the past, but neither does it renounce it, honestly appraising the experience of history and all its contradictions. The party views the October Socialist Revolution as one of the great events in world history, and values highly the struggle of several generations of Soviet people and millions of Communists in the name of creating a just socialist society. Nobody has the right to deny the profound influence of the Soviet era on world economic and social progress and the national-liberation movement.

At the same time, the CPSU does not conceal the mistakes made in the course of socialist building, and resolutely condemns tyranny and gross distortions of the principles of socialism and people's power, drawing lessons from the difficult and dramatic history of the party and country. In no circumstances can Communists deviate from the principle of the inseparability of socialism and democracy, or distance proclaimed aims from the real economic and social interests of the people. Major social reforms must proceed from the interests of the individual and the demands of life, and find support in the vital creativity of the masses and the ever-evolving vision of the socialist social order.

Now, at a time of heated debates over the character and aims of perestroyka, the conclusion drawn in the draft program has principled significance: "The entire course of our history has made perestroyka vitally necessary." It prompted deep changes connected with democratization, the development of glasnost, the reform of property relations, the transition from an overcentralized state to a union based on self-determination and the voluntary association of peoples. A qualitatively new phase in the development of international relations is also connected with perestroyka.

Along with this the party talks openly about difficulties in realizing the planned reforms, the miscalculations which have affected the development of the economy and the sociopolitical atmosphere in society. It is possible that some people will see the list of crisis phenomena as incomplete, and obviously different approaches toward the analysis of their causes will emerge. But the main thing today is not to draw our attention yet again to the "negative," which is frequently the case in the pages of the press and in party forums at various levels. The most important thing is the search for the best ways of solving urgent problems, and moreover not by overthrowing democracy and returning to totalitarianism, but, on the contrary, via a more energetic and consistent realization of those reforms which have already been started.

As noted at the CPSU Central Committee July Plenum, the draft is both a program for the future and a plan of concrete actions for today and tomorrow, and it can be supplemented and enriched during the transformation of society.

There is no doubt that this key section of the program will also be at the center of the partywide discussion. The problems of developing the Soviet multinational state and the system of soviets; the transition to a mixed economy based on the diversity and equality of various forms of ownership; the formation of a regulated market economy and a modern agrarian policy—all this is being widely and heatedly discussed in the party and society. The discussion will tell us whether it is possible to "reconcile" the contrasting and at times opposing viewpoints. But already it is possible to predict that the discussion will be useful if the supporters of the various viewpoints approach it from constructive positions and with a sense of political responsibility. One cannot stand in the way of objectively vital reforms, but it is possible and necessary to do everything to ensure that these reforms do not entail a decline in people's living conditions, and that they become a means of boosting our economy and increasing its efficiency, the people's well-being, and the legal and social protection of citizens. Here there is scope for initiatives from party organizations and a creative quest by the Communists.

Founded almost a century ago as a political organization of the working class, today the CPSU, given the radical changes in the social structure of society, can count on realizing its aims only by consistently defending and expressing the interests of all working people. As the draft program stresses, it will support well-founded demands and initiatives from the working people and cooperate with mass movements of workers, peasants, the intelligentsia, women, young people, and veterans, and further their political education and organization, rallying them in a broad and multifaceted movement for social progress.

"Our party is open to broad cooperation"—indeed, this is the chief leitmotiv of this vital partywide document. The CPSU is taking account of the realities of the modern situation, rejecting claims to a monopoly in society. It will seek to realize the program aims through the broad propagation of its ideas, through work in the labor collectives and in neighborhoods, through participation in democratic elections, through its representatives in the organs of power, and through cooperation with trade unions and other social organizations and movements.

This presupposes a need for radical renewal of the party itself and the rejection of dogma and stereotypes in the theory and practice of its activity. The influence and authority of a politically effective party—which is the type of party the CPSU aims to be—directly depend upon ideological unity, the initiative and activeness of the party masses, organization, conscious discipline, and the moral stance of every Communist.

Profound democratization is the most important guideline for the renewal of the party. Of course, the majority of Communists agree with this, but the democratization process is not yet developing in the way required for today, never mind tomorrow. The force of inertia is still strong, as is the opposition of moribund structures, and bureaucracy and formalism in party work are still playing their part. What is needed is a deep, all-around discussion of those problems worrying Communists in order to find the most reliable solutions. That these solutions cannot be found through a return to the past is indisputable. Stagnation and the failure to progress would doom the party to political defeat.

The draft of the new program proceeds from a belief that the CPSU is capable of genuine renewal and ideological consolidation within its ranks. By drawing all communists into the process of elaborating and realizing party policy and exploiting a variety of resources and working methods in the representative organs of state power and management, it will be able to secure the realization of program aims, and express and defend in deed the interests of society's broad working strata, as well as the common national interests of the country's peoples. The democratization of the party and the initiation of extensive social dialogue must also entail a stronger role for the party media.

It has to be acknowledged that in previous programs the party at times proclaimed aims and guidelines which did not stem from a scientific analysis of reality. This led to a gap between word and deed and fostered illusions, the collapse of which generated mistrust among the people toward its policies. We pay dearly for such miscalculations. Therefore it is particularly important today to seek realism in political activity, to tirelessly enrich the ideological and theoretical arsenal, to react promptly to changing conditions, and to forecast real trends in social development.

While reviving and developing the original humanitarian principles of the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, the party includes in its ideological arsenal the entire wealth of national and world socialist, democratic thinking. In declaring our commitment to the idea of humane, democratic socialism, we regard Communism as a historical perspective, a social ideal based on pan-human values, the harmonious combination of progress and justice, and the free self-fulfillment of the personality.

A humane, democratic, socialist society cannot be built according to any theoretical model, but rather according to the practical implementation of the stated ideas and aims, the fundamental transformation of the economy and the political and social sphere, and the development of science, education, and culture. The party calls upon all Communists and progressive democratic forces around the country to assist the emergence of such a society, the aim and center of which is the free individual.

TASS Reviews 14 Aug Soviet Central Press

LD1408084991 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 14 Aug 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 14 TASS—PRAVDA highlighted alarming news on its front page today: The country is short of medicines dramatically. Clinics lack the necessities for surgery. Doctors warn: If no new supplies are forthcoming, many thousands of patients will not survive.

PRAVDA features an interview with Russian's Deputy Prime Minsiter Inga Grebeshova, chairperson of the committee for family affairs and demographic policy under the Russian Federation Council of Ministers. She discusses major social problems characteristic of the republic and the country as a whole. "The present standard of living is such that a family can afford no more than one child, as the wages of one working person enables the upkeep of only 0.5 child".

TRUD reports that the Ukraine has had to reintroduce rationing. Ration cards will be required from September 1 to buy food and other consumer goods. This was necessitated by the "full disruption of earlier economic ties and the dramatic drop in production of consumer goods and food in the country," the report from Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, says.

A report from Vilnius published in the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper says the protest action against the Vilnius-based OMV, special anti-riot police force, called by the Sajudis nationalist society, was a flop. A mere two or three hundred people turned out instead of expected 100,000. Meanwhile, the term is nearing expiry of the ultimatum addressed by Lithuanian leader Vytautas Landsbergis to the Soviet Government, demanding the withdrawal of OMON from Lithuanian territory within two weeks.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR) comments that "the planned large-scale political action against the Union structures in Lithuania" centered around pickets at the OMON headquarters in Vilnius, turned out a failure. The ballyhoo around the Vilnius-based OMON force was directed not so much against that force as against the Union statehood.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA devoted its "Debating Club" page to a discussion of the new Communist Party programme. Leningrad Regional Party Committee Secretary Yuriy Belov said in an interview headlined "Where is Perestroyka Heading?" that "perestroyka has changed its direction from renewing socialism to restoring capitalism". He says the draft programme is devoted not to rescuing the party but to saving the country.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries "a report from a district of inter-ethnic clashes on the Azerbaijan-Armenian border. It discusses the role played in these developments by regular Army and Interior Ministry units there. The author says a virtual civil war is raging in the region and cites atrocities against civilians perpetrated by both sides.

PRAVDA reports on the "successful completion of the main stage in the removal of a a dangerous radioactive installation in Lake Ladoga", where experiments with radioactive substances were carried out in the early fifties. Details of the operation are covered in an article published in the newspaper.

The founding congress of the Association of Stock Market Structures of the agro-industrial complex will be held in Moscow in the middle of September, SELSKAYA ZHIZN reports.

Chairman of the Russian commodity exchange told the newspaper that the new association "intends to create conditions for the accelerated transition to a market by all structures of the agro-industrial complex "irrespective of the form of ownership".

A report from the KGB Government Liaison Centre is published in TRUD. Glasnost has thrown open for the first time the door of this centre located in the heart of Moscow, the newspaper says.

PRAVDA' international section carries an exclusive interview with Palestine Liberation Organisation leader Yasir 'Arafat. Touching upon the Palestinian participation in the forthcoming international conference on the Mideast settlement the PLO leader notes that "the solution of the representation problem is in the exclusive competence of the Palestinian leadership". He stressed that "the proposed comprehensive and fair settlement for the region account should be taken not only of Arab-Israeli relations but the interests of the Palestinian people".

Economic

Pavlov on Cabinet Meeting, Economy, Food Supply

LD1308145891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1320 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] The country's prime minister, Valentin Pavlov, held his traditional meeting with journalists in Moscow today. The news conference dealt mainly with yesterday's sitting of the Presidium of the Cabinet of Ministers. Comrade Pavlov said, inter alia, the following:

[Begin Pavlov recording] We were instructed by the president to make a detailed examination of these issues and to find solutions. We discussed practical and specific solutions as to how we shall stand with regard to food and fuel in the oncoming autumn and winter, how we shall fare in this test. We singled out two fundamental matters, upon which the foundation of a third was then built.

As you yourselves understand, the first matter for any society, for any state, is that of food stocks. And one must quite precisely acknowledge the truth of the directives given by Lenin as far back as the start of the 1920s; because if the country's food stocks are insufficient, there can be no question of any real independence for that country. In this regard, we set out what we can and must do, and how, in order to ensure sufficient reserves of food; and how we must prepare ourselves to make rational use of them.

In so doing, we also had to sort out the question of completion of the harvest campaign. I ought to say, however, that we had a draft decree prepared in which we wanted to resolve a number of issues through the soviets, on what the oblasts, krays, and republics are to do; they have to introduce a state of emergency, to mobilize, and so forth. Well, yesterday's discussion demonstrated quite precisely that today this is not only unnecessary, but could even be harmful. Why? Because the actual situations in the localities are wholly different. Unfortunately, we failed to take account of the fact that many areas have long since resolved these matters, and resolved them taking account of local conditions. Any such general solution, any global and uniform solution, is yet again a sort of fragment of the past: to repeat that would be the sort of mistake we have seen more than once in our practice of both state and economic construction.

We were not only talking about how this harvest is to be brought in and about the overwintering, but, in general, about which way to go, about the light at the end of the tunnel. Because we cannot deal with these issues today—as we have said many times—without seeing where these decisions will lead us all tomorrow. So we talked at the same time about how we are to bring our agriculture—in actual fact, and not just in words—to the level that would enable it to provide an actual stock of foodstuffs for the country. In this sense, too, we discussed matters relating to setting up (Agrogossnab) [state agricultural supply body] yesterday.

Second, we came to decide that what is needed today is to make use of the experience of the NEP [New Economic Policy] after all, and to offer the peasants goods in exchange for their grain.

The second issue was fuel. First of all, we sought ways to ensure that we had heat and light. We came to the unanimous conclusion that our difficulties were the result of two causes. The first reason relates to the earlier strikes. Unfortunately, the consumers have lower stocks of fuel going into winter—approximately 10 milion tonnes—and so we need intensified work to be done today in this aspect of work.

However, there is also a second reason. It is connected with the fact that, under the influence of purely political factors, we have found ourselves faced with the need—unfortunately not always justified from both the economic point of view and the ecological, purely human point of view—to change the thrust of our energy policy. On the fundamental level, from the point of view of (?schooling the country in economics) we know how to resolve this issue, and today we are dealing with it in practice. However, individual regions will nonetheless, for the reasons I told you about, experience a shortage of electricity. This affects first and foremost the North Caucasus regions and Transbaykal, and there will be difficulties with the supply for the Far East.

Well, the third issue runs on from the first, adding the political question. That is finance and monetary circulation. [end recording]

Says Famine 'Avoidable'

LD1308202991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1840 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Interview with USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov by Leonid Khatayevich on the "Topical Interview" program; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Khatayevich] Valentin Sergeyevich, almost a month has passed since you last met the television viewers in the "Topical Interview" slot. How would you describe this month? What are the main processes developing in the economy? Are there any among them that could be called positive?

[Pavlov] The wave that was started during the winter months, properly speaking, the one connected with various faults in the operation of the national economy caused by the most varied factors—from economic to foreign and domestic political ones—this wave, so to speak, continued. It was subsiding, but nevertheless, it had its effect upon the national economy. At the same time, there were other essentially large-scale processes in the economy that were linked with the start of summer field operations. You know, it is sad, perhaps, but nevertheless the lesson of last year became for many people a lesson, I would say, which people understood correctly and from which they drew practical conclusions. In this sense, despite the fact that today we have fallen and continue to fall in terms of oil extraction, the production of engine fuel, metal, and so on, on the whole we have managed to provide the volumes of deliveries of daily necessities, let us say, to the agro-industrial complex, and in some cases we have even managed to increase them, albeit sometimes behind schedule or at long intervals. At the same time, we could not physically insure an increase of supplies to agriculture by a new order of magnitude; we simply did not have such resources at our disposal.

Nevertheless, this, too, was made good to a considerable extent—I would put it like this—by the hard, one might even say by the super-hard work of the workers of our agro-industrial complex, in general our mechanics, our milkmaids, those who labor in the countryside. In this sense we say that of course today they are indeed performing what I would call the role of the anchor that has applied the brakes and made it possible to conduct the work of stabilization in the economy, counteracting both our own negative trends and counteracting those unfavorable conditions that nature has of course brought us this year.

[Khatayevich] In connection with the food problem, is the range of foodstuffs that are rationed going to be extended this winter as a result of the harvest forecasts?

[Pavlov] I would put it like this: A noticeable redistribution of levels of consumption is now taking place in our country. Producer regions, to put it crudely, are raising their consumption level today, and generally speaking this is a natural and normal process. One cannot for the whole of one's life have the kind of policy that means the cobbler has no boots. This process of equalizing, therefore, is clearly showing through today and in this respect it is evidently going to continue further here. But we have it in mind... [changes thought] we cannot say that tomorrow we will abolish all coupons for sugar, for example, because we know perfectly well that given all the conditions, no matter how the situation shapes up, the country has of its own sugar precisely half the quantity it consumes. The rest it has to acquire. Therefore we cannot cancel this today precisely to prevent hold-ups later, so in one place or in one month there is plenty but in the next there is nothing.

[Khatayevich] My question was this: Is an extension of the range of rationing being planned? Apparently not, judging by your answer.

[Pavlov] I have to tell you that we took the following decision, that these questions should not be tackled on a state-wide scale. They should be solved precisely on the basis of the specific, local conditions of the processing industry.

[Khatayevich] Dreadful words like famine have been cropping up in the press and on various occasions where journalists and politicians talk about the coming winter. Does this word feature in your discussions and those of your colleagues at the Cabinet of Ministers, or is this simply an attempt to frighten our people, so to speak?

[Pavlov] I must tell you absolutely frankly, in front of this camera and looking people in the eyes, that the country has everything necessary to avoid famine. In this respect, organization and discipline are the only conditions that there are. In fact, this must be implemented in the most resolute way in the area of both harvesting, preserving, processing and, what is especially important, in the area of distributing the food.

It seems to me that in the form in which it is today being submitted for signing, it will require a change in the structure of power, including that of executive power. I personally am very much afraid, very much afraid that we have started a large-scale division of our single national economic complex, underpinning this division with a legal basis.

I am not a lawyer and I do not take it upon myself to judge to what extent this legal basis has a firm foundation. Nevertheless, we have started dividing up our single national economic complex and thus, whether we want it or not, this division is a weakening of this complex. When it will be put together in a new combination and at a new level, I do not know. But there is no doubt either that this will require a fairly long time. Therefore any division means the emergence of barriers and junctions, and to pass through them will certainly require additional efforts. In connection with this, I, for instance, am almost 100-percent certain that today's division is simply inopportune. We have a fairly complicated situation both in food and in fuel provision and altogether with everyday goods, so to speak, to maintain the population's living standard. For this reason, I, for instance, think that dividing things up is not something timely. On the contrary, we must unite.

[Khatayevich] To survive the winter.

[Pavlov] Well, you know, we must not only survive the winter, what we must do is live until the following summer when we, having realized everything that we have done and having understood the reasons and the ways whereby at last we need to get out of this, because a real way out can only be achieved when this becomes, I would say, directly implanted in the mass consciousness, if indeed the necessity of some or other steps and actions, united actions, becomes anchored in mass consciousness, only then is a real way out of the crisis possible. [sentence as heard] It is not enough for me to tell you that you must go and do this and that. But you and the others, until they understand that this really needs to be done and that there is no other possibility of getting out of this; and until you and the others, to whom this is addressed and on whom this depends, understand that not moving and simply sitting and maintaining that stance, that situation that obtains today, is impossible because there is no status quo in life, there is no permanency. [sentence as heard]

[Khatayevich] There is movement.

[Pavlov] There is movement, either forwards or backwards.

[Khatayevich] And the last question. Are you an optimist? Do you believe that you will be understood?

[Pavlov] At any rate, I am convinced of this, but that is another matter.

[Khatayevich] Thank you!

[Pavlov] You are welcome.

Comments on Gasoline Price

LD1308191991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1720 GMT 13 Aug 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] At today's press conference given by Prime Minister Pavlov, journalists intended to ask a lot of questions and to get a clear answer to each. [video cuts to conference; Pavlov shown saying: I should have to give a long answer to that]

[Correspondent A. Shashkov] During his one and a half-hour long news conference Valentin Pavlov managed to answer only two questions. An answer about yesterday's Cabinet of Ministers meeting was evidently what he had prepared for homework, and lasted an hour. During that time the prime minister managed to speak about the prospects for the harvest and the problems of the fuel and energy complex. He complained of the public's dislike of nuclear power stations and said that because of that, a number of the regions of the country would suffer a shortage of electricity in the next five years.

Pavlov condemned the Russian leadership for trying to raise wages, including those of the Kuzbass miners, and warned that the raising of oil purchase prices by the

Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic would sharply increase the level of prices as a whole.

Answering a question on the possible rise in the gasoline price, the head of the cabinet said:

[Begin Pavlov recording] Proposals have twice been made and put forward about raising retail prices for gasoline and so on. Both times we categorically turned them down. We consider that today's retail gasoline price must not be changed. It is a different matter that we consider it expedient to examine the question of establishing single prices for gasoline, for state and private transport, in order, so to say, if I may, to stop this transfusion [of petrol sold privately, at marked up prices, by drivers of state vehicles who originally obtain the petrol at subsidised state prices]. [end recording]

Says Crisis Will Be 'Overcome'

LD1308125391 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] The Soviet economy has stopped slumping and at present it is in an unbalanced state. This has been said by Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov at a meeting in Moscow with the readers of the newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. He voiced confidence that, having rich natural resources, a great intellectual potential, and qualified specialists, the Soviet Union will overcome the economic crisis. At the same time Mr. Pavlov has admitted that it would be hardly possible to finish perestroyka before the end of the year.

When reproached that the government's anti-crisis program is being realized very slowly, the prime minister said that he opposes shock methods. The population, he said, is not ready now to make more sacrifices for the sake of accelerating reforms, which are inevitably connected with higher prices and lower living standards.

PRAVDA Reports News Briefing

PM1408141191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Aug 91 Second Edition p 2

["Observer's Column" report by Aleksandr Nikitin: "The Enigma of Simple Truths, or What Is Happening to the Country's Economy?"]

[Text] Yesterday USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov tried to make jokes at the press conference, for example saying solemnly that from far away "all cats look gray" but at close range it turns out that they are multicolored. Thus, according to the prime minister, it was on the basis of this almost "scientific" mystery that republic representatives proceeded at the Cabinet of Ministers sitting, when they rejected yet another attempt to adopt "emergency" measures to save the economy. The republic leaders took another two or three days to reflect on it in order to determine the extent to which the market is "multicolored."

The most acute questions were about food. According to calculations, on average several quintals of grain per hectare less than last year will be gathered. And this will primarily be reflected in the reduction of state purchases. Farms are keeping back grain for themselves to exchange it for what they need most.

"The situation that has now formed recalls 1928-1929," V.S. Pavlov noted, "that is, the eve of collectivization, when it was very difficult to buy grain from a peasant. Barter flourished. Are we ready for this?"

You certainly cannot set up food requisition detachments again, with commissars in leather coats. Not much would change even if you made them wear fashionable jeans. At the moment the government sees the solution in redistributing and selling industrial goods to the benefit of rural inhabitants. But how can this best be done? Spontaneous forces must be countered with logic, well-ordered organization, and precise calculations. And so the Cabinet of Ministers talked about creating an "Agrogossnab" [state agricultural supply body] in order to establish an advantageous exchange of goods and produce. And here the prime minister even mentioned the word "alliance" ["smychka"] [between city and countryside].

You listen to these predictions and unwittingly catch yourself thinking that all this has already happened more than once. Supply bodies have been formed, "alliances" have been established, and goods have been promised to the countryside. But simple truths are still a kind of mystery. Even paying dollars for the sale of our own grain in our own country did not help, because this still did not reflect the agricultural workers' real expenditure.

In a word, it is difficult to obtain grain today, and even more difficult to procure it for state store-houses. And, furthermore, the same goes for fuel. Here too not all cats are gray.

A particularly explosive situation has formed in the Kuzbass, the head of government believes. The situation there is completely different from the situation in the countryside. The coal from that region is the cheapest and the Russian Government has increased the miners' earnings several times over even though the productivity of the mines has stayed the same. It is not hard to guess what may result from this in other coal fields: There is a danger that a number of the country's regions will live in the cold in the winter. The government is contemplating stopping coke batteries and blast furnaces.

One American businessman told me that the administrations of a number of [U.S.] states have found an original way—from his point of view—of seeking an alliance with their "greens." Power engineering companies can "freeze" new nuclear electric power stations [AES] or not open them at all if that is what the majority of the population wants. But in that case they are forced to pay more for electricity borrowed from elsewhere. Or live on a meager ration.

It is possible that certain regions of our country will be subjected to a similar type of experiment. V.S. Pavlov named them: Zaporozhye, the North Caucasus, Konakovo, and Rostov-na-Donu. Admittedly this is not a question of an alliance but of the fact that all these areas were previously geared to an AES. It will not be possible to compensate for all these losses with liquid or solid fuel...

The republics did not support the proposal made by the USSR Ministry of Economics and Forecasting to "freeze" essentially the whole economy: They rejected the idea of restraint on price rises and on earnings at the same time. V.S. Pavlov called this policy one of emissions. Evidently the main thing now is to create economic ties—new market ones.

It seems that there are already some preliminary outlines. And the republics have understood that the people cannot eat parliamentary sovereignties. The Baltic republics have shown an interest in next year's plan. Armenia and Georgia have asked that their economic potential and wishes be taken into consideration. Will the basic truths actually find their places, will it really be established what is a priority and what is secondary, so to speak? What supports what?

IZVESTIYA Reports News Briefing

PM1308204591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by V. Romanyuk: "On the Art of Preparing the Sleigh in Summer... and Reaching Agreement With the Republics"]

[Text] USSR Prime Minister V. Pavlov needed around an hour to answer the very first question asked at the news conference 13 July 1991: Which problems did the USSR Cabinet of Ministers consider at its sitting the previous evening?

A seemingly prosaic question: preparation for winter. But it encompassed two key problems: providing food for the population and supplying fuel to enterprises. Actually, these problems had already been considered by the cabinet under the chairmanship of M.S. Gorbachev prior to his vacation, and the question of implementing the adopted decisions has now been studied.

Speaking about food matters, Pavlov cited Lenin's well-known principle that if the country does not have sufficient food stocks there cannot be any question of real independence. Although in many respects we depend on weather conditions and are in a "risky" agriculture zone, we nevertheless harvest so much grain that, given such a crop, other countries would be selling it. But we continue to purchase grain, because our feed expenditure is two to two and a half times greater than that of foremost countries. It must be supposed that on the latest occasion the cabinet showed its resolve to change the structure of livestock raising by giving preference to fast-maturing types—poultry raising and pig raising.

Later, speaking about the harvest itself, Pavlov gave his assurance that it has been decided not to adopt the elaborated draft presidential decree ordering the introduction of an state of emergency and the mobilization of transportation everywhere. Why? "From above all cats look gray", the premier explained, "but the situations in the provinces are diverse. And any attempt at making uniform decisions or elaborating schemes similar to the bed of Procrustes is mistaken and altogether looks like a throwback to the past. In short, there will be no all-embracing directives or principles, and if somebody in the provinces is lacking rights, all right, he will obtain them."

Incidentally, the cabinet also tackled certain long-term questions—of setting up Agrosnab [state agricultural supply body] in particular, and also of utilizing the experience from the New Economic Plan [from the 1920s] in commodity exchange between the city and the countryside. Only it is important that goods intended to be exchanged for grain should get to the peasant. Here "coupon" and "ration" systems were condemned, which actually turned into the handing out of blank bits of paper: Now the peasant simply does not trust them. In this connection the strengthening of the consumer cooperative system's role in commodity exchange envisaged, so that it is carried out at the level of the individual producer.

Describing the country's fuel and energy situation as alarming, Pavlov cited the deficit figure: Consumers received 10 million tonnes of fuel less than the requirement. Another problem is associated with the freezing of AES [nuclear electric power station] units under construction, which has been caused by the "Chernobyl syndrome." Sooner or later this problem will have to be resolved. In the premier's opinion, the Kuzbass remains a dangerously explosive region socially, especially after the decisions adopted by the Russian Government. Specifically, local miners' wages, increased to 1,700-2,000 rubles [R], have exceeded miners' wages in neighboring Karaganda four to five times. And prices for coal are set such that there is the prospect of its getting more expensive in other regions too. When all is said and done the Kuzbass has not increased coal production. The cabinet decided to shut down a number of coke batteries and blast furnaces in connection with the acute lack of coking coals. In the final analysis this will turn into losses of 5 million tonnes of metal.

Speaking about the problems of finances and money circulation—and they were also considered by the Cabinet of Ministers—V. Pavlov noted that their stabilization is directly linked with production and labor remuneration. A radical measure was proposed: Freezing prices and wages. However, the republics rejected this proposal out of hand, or more precisely, they would have liked to preempt it with measures to put the wages situation in their own sectors in order. But what does "putting in order" mean? Russia alone will additionally require around R25 billion for these purposes. Having announced a budget deficit of R81 billion, Russia has transferred its "submerged" part to the state debt, but this, in Pavlov's opinion, is not changing the situation for the better; moreover, these decisions are of an emissionary nature and are economically unfounded. The premier bitterly stated that certain republics are operating according to the well-known joke: "Reduce the apparatus but lengthen the coil."

The question of the economic agreement between the center and the republics was on the Cabinet of Ministers' agenda, but according to the premier discussion of it did not actually take place because "the material was sent out too late." But evidently the reason lay elsewhere: The representative of Georgia managed to make a statement on this question, declaring that the republic exports much more to neighboring republics than it receives from them. It must be supposed that a stormy discussion of this question still lies ahead.

Answering a question on his attitude to B. Yeltsin's statement in Tyumen concerning a necessary increase in oil prices, the premier noted that in principle he is against nonsystemic decisions.

Yavlinskiy on Fate of 'Harvard' Reform Program

LD1308135191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 12 Aug 91

[Interview with economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy by correspondent A. Shashkov; place and date not given; first paragraph is announcer's introduction—recorded]

[Excerpt] The name of Grigoriy Yavlinskiy has recently somewhat faded into the background, after hitting the headlines at the end of the spring and the start of the summer in connection with the Western-aided draft economic reform program in the USSR, which he drew up in Harvard just before Gorbachev's meeting with the Big Seven in London. We decided to find out what Yavlinskiy is doing at the moment.

[Shashkov] The program was, in effect, not adopted. What will happen to it now?

[Yavlinskiy] The program did indeed play a certain role. It played its role in the sense that after discussion of the Soviet Union's economic problems in London, the door has not been slammed shut, on the whole. What did not come off was that all this had a minimal impact—or no impact at all—on our life here at home; it had absolutely no effect whatsoever on our internal programs, on the internal affairs (?of the Soviet side). In this sense, of course, we have stayed at the positions we started from.

From the point of view of the future, if we allow that we shall return to an understanding of the fact that we must openly and honestly carry out a whole series of transformations, and that for this we may perhaps have need of the support of or interaction with Western countries—not the sort that leads to nothing but huge expenditure of money so we are always in debt—in this case, the actual approach and conception of the program remains, in general. But this is not permanent, either. If it comes about in the foreseeable future, one could work according to our program, but if organic changes come about...

[Shashkov] And in Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's opinion, such changes are already starting. He describes this as the engendering of a serious mafia economy. [passage omitted] [video shows Shashkov interviewing Yavlinskiy in an office]

Japan To Help Prevent Rise of Monopolies

LD1308162791 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Solnetsev]

[Text] Tokyo August 13 TASS—Japan and other Western countries will help the Soviet Union and East European countries privatise state property in order to protect free enterprise from a capital monopoly that may replace a monopoly of the state.

Japanese Foreign Trade Ministry official told TASS on Tuesday that the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry and the Commission for Fair Deals plan to participate in activities by the organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, viewed as an integral part of "intellectual assistance" to countries moving towards market relations.

A ministry official from the Department for the USSR and Eastern Europe told TASS by phone that this year the ministry plans to send experts to the Soviet Union and train Soviet specialists to help carry out reforms in the Soviet Union.

The United States, Germany and other Western countries have similar intentions, the Japanese business newspaper NIHON KEIZAI says.

The Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development will fill these plans with substance this autumn and begin to implement them in 1992.

The newspaper writes that the anti-monopoly legislation and controlling bodies aim to prevent abuse by former state enterprises of their dominating positions in certain sections of the economy after privatization. They will also help build legal barriers for raising prices by cartels, while moving from state- controlled to free prices.

The newspaper says Western countries hope that their help to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe will help promote Western-like rules of free enterprise and that their policies would be coordinated with other countries.

Western countries plan to extend their assistance in working out laws, in order to avoid contradictions with their laws. This will ensure the organic integration of the Soviet Union into the world economy. This issue was thoroughly discussed during Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the G-7 meeting in London in July.

Gosbank Hikes Loan Interest From 8 to 12 Percent

PM0508104591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Article by I. Zhagel: "Money Getting More Expensive"]

[Text] Substantial changes in the unified state monetary and credit policy for the second half of 1991 were notified to all the country's banking institutions last Friday via a government telegram.

Incidentally, in the light of the sharp deterioration of the situation in the national economy during the first half of the year and the more than 40-percent increase in money circulation, the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] has already submitted for examination by the country's Supreme Soviet its own proposals for amending the monetary and credit policy as the most important factor in stabilizing the economy. However, there was simply no time to discuss these proposals at the recently concluded parliamentary session which, frankly speaking, seems a little strange.

Nevertheless, the USSR Gosbank decided to act. Its planned measures were expounded in the government telegram.

First of all, there is a substantial increase in the payment for centralized credit resources—from 8 to 12 percent per year. Clearly this move pursues several aims: First, to ensure that commercial banks seek out money for their market operations by drawing all unutilized resources into circulation and only as a last resort turning to centralized sources, as the latter become increasingly costly. This is an efficient restrictive measure against unjustified increases of the monetary mass.

Second, the increased cost of money borrowed from the central bank will prompt commercial banks to also raise the cost of their credit. Now enterprises and organizations will have to be clear about how they are going to utilize resources before borrowing any money. Is the project they want to realize sufficiently viable to enable them to settle accounts with creditors at a later date?

In general, the policy of "expensive money" is widely applied in world practice. Moreover, given the rate of inflation in the country and the rapid development of crisis processes, an even sharper increase in the cost of centralized credit resources could have been expected. In any event, this would be the logic "in theory."

Commenting this decision, V. Zakharov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosbank Board, said that initially there were plans to increase the cost of centralized credit resources to 15 percent. But considering that many enterprises have now begun a structural perestroyka envisaging the production of consumer goods, it was decided that even collectives which are not too strong financially should be given a chance to reequip.

At this point, however, several counterarguments can be introduced, the main one being that the cost of credit resources, which though not low is by no means high, will still lead to their being squandered in a number of cases. Obviously, having made money more expensive, it would have been better to make use of additional tax benefits for enterprises which master the production of consumer goods. Actually, V. Zakharov did not rule out a further increase in the cost of centralized credit resources before the end of the year.

Yet another important fact will be the strict restriction on the margin—that is, the difference between the amount of money the bank borrows and the amount it lends—to just 3 percent overall. Clearly, this measure is taken from the list of market methods for controlling the credit and money system and will probably be rather unwelcome by the commercial banks.

On the other hand, the desire by central organs to restrict opportunities for speculative operations with financial resources is understandable. After all, in a monopolistic economy, high-interest loans to enterprises often entail a sharp increase in the cost of products. And here V. Zakharov said quite rightly that it is impossible for one part of the national economy to function fully in accordance with market laws while all other sectors merely remain on the fringes of this market. Nevertheless, it is clear even to the naked eye, so to speak, how commercial banks will be able to bypass the set limit on margins.

Finally, there are plans to increase the allocation of bank resources to reserve funds. The size of these allocations will vary according to the time for which banks attract financial resources, so it is hardly appropriate mentioning them here. Suffice it to say that this measure is also widely applied in banking practice and, in a simplified form, means the following: The bank must allocate part of any money it acquires from whatever source to the Union and republic central bank reserves.

Thus, the amount of money currently in circulation is decreasing and banks must think carefully about where they will invest their money so that the profit received allows them to repay any money they have borrowed in full.

Greater Thrift in Energy Consumption Urged

PM1308094191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Aug 91 Second Edition p 1

[Article by G. Yastrebtsov "Current Topic" as part of the "Economic Panorama" feature: "Energetically... Without Energy"]

[Text] *It is no longer possible to find words to describe what lies in store for us: Congresses, sessions, and plenums have been held, but political passions rage unabated. And we are still promised not quite paradise, but at least a trace of light along life's distant horizon. No sooner had Deputy Premier Shcherbakov dropped a slight hint that economic decline seems to have leveled off, no sooner had people cheered up slightly—maybe this is not yet the dead-end, maybe, maybe...—and the would-be reformists cried out: "You are being deceived. You are being led to destruction."*

Yes, it is already an immutable fact that our economy is in a state of profound crisis. But what is the point in us shouting it from the rooftops time and again, holding fresh sessions about it, and arguing afresh about it? Everything is wiser and simpler in daily life. Lamentable though this may be, many forget about the people in the fierce and at times fruitless clashes of the struggle for power. They forget about each and every ordinary individual person. Meanwhile, that person is living, working, and awaiting better times. It is, after all, thanks to him that we are still keeping head above water—harvesting the grain, casting steel, and extracting coal.

The people have plenty of strength. It is only their patience that is running out.... But even so they are still working hard. You will find out about this from the material in today's "Economic Panorama."

Energy resources are figuratively described as the most stable currency. This is correct—after all, in today's world it is impossible to imagine even a single economic sector operating without the use of electricity or heat energy. The energy resources problem becomes especially acute in our harsh winter conditions.

An alarming fact: The gap between the growth of electricity consumption and the potential for satisfying the growing needs is getting wider as we approach the five-year plan's end. This is how this appears in figures: While the national economy's consumption increased by 12 percent over the five-year period, there was only a 9-percent addition to energy capacities, including an 8-percent addition to heat generating stations.

Many factors have had a detrimental effect on the state of the country's electricity generation. One of them was the review of the concept of the sector's development following the Chernobyl accident. It is well known that power units with a total capacity of 3.4 million kilowatts were mothballed and decommissioned at the Armenian, Novovoronezhskaya, Beloyarskaya, Khmelnitskaya, and Rostovskaya Nuclear Power Stations [AES]. In addition, construction was halted at the Crimean, Tatar, Bashkir, and several other AES's. I make no secret of my sympathy and understanding for the public movement for a clean environment and protection of nature. But there is something else that must also be realized: How are we to implement the appeal by the Union and republic governments, people's deputies, and political parties to more energetically pursue the economy's perestroyka and accelerate scientific and technical progress when disruptions in energy supplies have almost become the norm? Evidently, an alternative acceptable by all must be sought. Not to reject the construction of energy supply projects but to make them as safe and as ecologically clean as possible.

The country emerged from last winter with fuel stocks in consumers' hands at a much lower level than in the winter of 1989-1990. And the situation at present is extremely tense.

A recent sitting of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers Presidium discussed ways to better prepare for the coming winter and urgent measures to be taken in order to reduce the shortage of energy resources. It is specifically planned to commission the Yamburg gas field installation for the comprehensive processing of gas and to hand over 1,500 km of the linear section of the gas pipeline linking Tyumen Oblast's northern rayons and the Urals, as well as 12 compression stations along the two Yamburg-Tula gas pipelines. Four compressor stations will be commissioned and 300 wells will come on line at underground gas storage facilities in the Ukraine, the Volga River Valley, the Central region, and Northern Caucasus.

As for the shortage of power generating capacities, it is estimated at about 7 million kilowatts. The situation is as difficult as ever in the Northern Caucasus, the Transcaucasus, Chita Oblast, the Transbaykal region, and the Far East. It is necessary to commission generating capacities in these regions more quickly, monitor the consumption of energy more strictly, and apply a rigid energy-saving regime.

It is already obvious that we can meet the targets for the extraction and supply of fuel and get through the winter only if energy and fuel are sparingly consumed. It is necessary to introduce variable price rates for fuel and electricity and make utmost use of other economic levers which would encourage consumers to adopt a more thrifty attitude toward resources.

Importance of Western Technical Aid Highlighted

PM1408105991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

["Topic of the Day" article by I. Zhagel: "Bank for a New Economy"]

[Text] Prior to the G-7 meeting in London the press actively discussed how much foreign currency we need to carry out our reforms and how much we might be given. After the meeting it was clear that no one intends to give us money just like that and that we can only count on technical assistance. But is there any point in setting the one off against the other? And what actually does technical assistance mean?

Our notion of this is as yet highly abstract. It is therefore worth illustrating what technical assistance does mean by a specific and highiy instructive example.

Work has now started on setting up a Bank for Project Development and Financing through the joint efforts of the Soviet side and a number of international organizations. Its task is to facilitate the structural perestroyka of our economy. It will operate on the same principles as obtain in Western banking.

What, then, are those principles? Let us start with the fact that the World Bank isolates six stages in the investment cycle: the search for investment opportunities; assessment of the project's profitability and the risk involved; drawing up a finance plan; conclusion of mutually binding agreements; fulfillment of the production, commercial, and financial program until all credit has been paid off; assessment of the financial results of the project and comparison of the actual results with the planned results.

In our country, however, all these links have been sundered and fall within the competence of different departments. Our new commercial banks, however, limit their concerns to granting short-term credit for commercial and broking transactions. They do not want to get involved in the structural perestroyka of the economy.

Therefore the creation of a bank in our country which operates according to the system employed in the West is of fundamental importance. This guarantees highly effective investments which will enable essential changes to be made in the economy. But that is just one aspect of the matter. The second is that such a bank helps attract... foreign private capital.

In actual fact glib explanations regarding the advantages of a particular project in our country are scarcely going to persuade Western businessmen. Only the in-depth study of a question customary for Western firms could interest them. They would deal with a basis of standards which they understand and the use of methods of expert analysis and systems for managing and monitoring transactions which have been tried and tested in the West.

Hence it is clear that technical assistance is not an alternative to financial support but an essential prerequisite for attractinmg major investments, particularly from owners of private capital who want guarantees that their money will not be squandered.

Who, then, is participating in the Bank for Project Development and Financing? According to S. Konychev, chairman of the organizing committee, among the foreign partners three main ones may be cited. First, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD], with which a special memorandum has already been signed. This document says, in particular, that the EBRD intends to contribute its own share to the incorporation capital and will maintain a credit line for the Bank for Project Development and Financing.

An important role is being played here by the British Government's know-how fund, which has decided to finance the project. On the basis of a competition organized by it foreign firms were selected which, in conjunction with our specialists, are to prepare detailed technical-economic feasibility documentation, incorporation documents, and a phased program for setting up the bank and mobilizing resources for it by November. In particular, a contract to carry out this work has been signed with the Arthur Andersen consulting firm, the Morgan Grenfell investment bank, and the Theodore Goddard law firm.

Finally, an accord has been reached with the Commission of the European Communities: The Commission will finance subsequent programs for creating bank systems—accounting, data-analysis, and control systems. Money for training specialists in the spheres of banking, investment, accounts analysis, law, and information techologies will also come from this source.

Thus we will very soon have a new bank, one which will actually—rather than just talking about it—get Western financial capital involved in the renewal of our economy. And I consider that to be just as important as getting a sum of money in hard currency.

And one more thing, the new bank will carry out investment activity on the territory of those republics which show an interest in it. The republics could also become shareholders in the bank. It is also intended to distribute some of the shares among the population.

Further 3 Aug Cabinet Presidium Session Reportage

PM1408083191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Aug 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS observer B. Grishchenko: "Time Does Not Wait. From the Sitting of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers Presidium"]

[Text] Food, the fuel and energy complex, and finances—this, figuratively speaking, is the triad which governs our society's life in the immediate future. The newspapers have already reported that these actual questions were discussed in detail at an enlarged session of the Cabinet of Ministers Presidium, held last Saturday [3 August] under the chairmanship of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev.

We are in no position to fully describe for our readers the hours-long, tense, and at times even sharp debate. We will limit ourselves to just the appraisals and proposals concerning ways to solve the tasks which, in the session participants' opinion, are especially important for the country's survival in today's difficult conditions.

Opening the session, M.S. Gorbachev noted that a new Union treaty has been prepared, and it will soon be open for signature. Its elaboration is the result of difficult quest and the adoption of tough decisions. This is why it is necessary to responsibly and persistently seek coordinated and effective solutions to the paramount problems facing the country.

But what were the approaches taken by speakers toward the solution of the range of problems under consideration?

USSR Deputy Prime Minister F.P. Senko dwelt on the questions of progress in gathering the harvest and of the situation taking shape with regard to the country's food supply. Speaking of ways to normalize food supplies under conditions of the transition to the market, he proposed for 1992 an option in which, in his view, enhanced responsibility locally is combined with a strengthening of the Union's coordinating functions. In the proposed option the state order remains obligatory for execution by all for whom it is set. Economic liability must be instituted for failure to fulfill it. It is also proposed to widely attract foreign investments to the agro-industrial complex, above all for the development of the infrastructure with regard to the storage and processing of produce.

In conditions when a series of the country's regions have been hit by drought, the speakers noted, there is need for precise coordination of efforts by the center and the republics to promptly bring in the harvest, reduce the loss of produce, and ensure maximum procurement of coarse and succulent feeds. Efforts by cities and the countryside must be pooled for this purpose, while industrial enterprises and organizations must immediately send people and means of transportation to the countryside. It is necessary to accelerate the delivery of material and technical resources to the agro-industrial complex so as to complete the preparation of all food industry enterprises for the reception and processing of sugar beet and of oil-yielding and other crops.

The debate focused especially on the determination of economic measures to ensure the purchase of the greatest possible quantity of grain, potatoes, vegetables, and other foodstuffs for this year's state resources from kolkhozes, sovkhozes, individual farmers, and citizens' personal subsidiary farms. It was noted that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, republic governments, and local soviets must display flexibility and efficiency in organizing the purchases of agricultural produce and raw materials.

Summing up the results of the discussion, the president said, in particular:

How we will implement the policy of purchases—of grain, above all—is very important. I believe it is necessary to combine two aspects. The regulation of volumes is obligatory here. But the peasant must also be given an interest in return. Everything must be done to ensure that production-technical resources reach the countryside. They must be diverted there. And the peasant must really feel this. It is necessary to involve the cooperative system and make use of imported consumer goods for these purposes.

The strengthening of economic incentives in the activity of the agro-industrial complex, the improvement of its provision with material and technical resources, and the realization of other possibilities for ensuring the population's steady food supply must be provided for in a special USSR presidential decree, whose draft has to be prepared as quickly as possible by Comrades F.P. Senko, V.A. Durasov, M.L. Tomishishin, and V.I. Chernoivanov, and be submitted to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers for submission to the president.

The submission of the union-republic "Grain" and "Protein" programs to the Soviet of the Federation also has to be accelerated in order, on the basis of their realization, to substantially increase production of grain and protein feed and subsequently reduce imports of them.

Then the Cabinet of Ministers Presidium examined the question of the state of affairs regarding fuel and energy resources.

Deputy Prime Minister L.D. Ryabev spoke and reported that the total quantity of fuel and energy resources for internal consumption in the country will be at last year's level. The meeting of current targets for the extraction and deliveries of fuel will ensure the winter maximum's availability provided fuel is thriftily consumed. The need to establish direct ties between energy producers and consumers was specifically mentioned among the pressing measures. There was also talk about introducing a variable scale of fuel and electricity prices and accelerating deliveries of material and technical resources for oil extraction.

The topic under discussion prompted a sharp debate. The assessment of the fuel situation failed to convince many people. It was proposed to tackle primarily the deeper perestroyka of production relations within the fuel and energy complex itself. Unless this is done, any hopes of boosting its sectors are illusory, the speakers noted.

It was pointed out that the approaches on which the draft resolution on measures to provide the national economy and the population with fuel and energy in the fall and winter period of 1991-1992 is based cannot be adopted in full, as they are underpinned chiefly by the principles of the administrative-edict system of management. In this connection the State Fuel and Energy Commission, in particular, has been entrusted with accelerating, jointly with the republic governments and Union organs, the preparation of proposals to restructure economic relations and improve the organizational structure of management of the fuel and energy complex in accordance with the tasks of the transition to the market.

No less strained a situation has also taken shape in the sphere of finances. Evaluating it, V.Ye. Orlov, head of the Union department, pointed out, in particular, that, despite a certain overall stabilization in May and June, the problem of the budget's implementation remains complex. The slump in the economy and the ongoing unilateral actions of a number of republics with regard to the Union budget are having their impact. Certain decisions leading to increased expenditure and a lower income are also having an adverse effect.

The proposals submitted by the minister for discussion include the consistent implementation of a tough regime of budget funding in accordance with reduced norms, the active putting into circulation of state securities—short-term and medium-term bonds, above all—the suspension of the launching of social programs with unconditional abstention from the adoption of new ones, and the redistribution of income among the levels of the budget system. It is necessary to find a possibility of using economic means to "tie down" the huge mass of money accumulated by enterprises and to prevent it from swamping the consumer market. Only the implementation of a unified, concerted policy in this sphere can keep inflationary processes in check. We have submitted these and other proposals and will discuss them with the republics, the USSR minister of finance reported.

Proposals for organizing an interrepublic committee for foreign investments were also examined at the session, in parallel with the tasks of preparing a package of immediate measures to stabilize the economy, taking the Union treaty provisions into account. It is proposed that the committee, to be formed by the republics themselves with the participation of Union organs, will reveal their initiative in attracting foreign capital. A draft USSR presidential decree is to be prepared on this question

We are facing two questions, M.S. Gorbachev said, summing up the results of the discussion: political and financial stability.

In the political sphere our hopes are pinned on the Union treaty, the clear allocation of competence between the Union and the republics, and the formation of a power capable of fulfilling its functions more persistently and responsibly. On this basis the war of laws is ended and order and discipline are strengthened. Without this—as theory and practice alike prove—reforms are impossible to implement. We have realized this and are doing everything to arrive at accord. This is important.

The second question sounds familiar: How will the problem of financial stabilization in our economy be tackled? Everything is important here—what measures will be taken, when will they be taken, and how will they be timed. And whether there will be enough will and determination to implement them consistently.

These are logical questions. All our ardent champions of reforms, whenever they address certain audiences, especially abroad, hold themselves to be really drastic radicals. The measures they propose often coincide with universal experience and the practice of financial stabilization. This has already been tried and tested, as the saying goes, by civilization at various stages, including the last few years.

Much of what has happened here is real economic populism. Some people try to promise as much as possible, so as to win prestige. And they have taken decisions whose fulfillment we are now having difficulty in sustaining. We should work out a specific philosophy, a style of behavior in an emergency situation, and, guided by this philosophy, pursue a specific political line and formulate a range of essential measures which should be implemented step by step.

Therefore, whenever we are overwhelmed by political—and now also by economic—populism, we must always bear in mind the question: What next? How does this fit in with the concept of extrication from the crisis and with the anticrisis program which we all now consider as our own joint program, when common aspirations are invested in it?

What about finances, the credit and monetary system? We acknowledge that we need the market. But what kind of market can you have if, in gross violation of economic logic, we seek to isolate ourselves and want to break up the unity of our finances?

Can you seriously talk about many different monetary units in a single country? Of course not. We cannot get carried away by illusions and build castles in the air. This comes from ignorance. This being the case, we must borrow other people's knowledge. Why reinvent the wheel?

Our chosen approaches are prescribed by the logic of the development of economic processes, by the interconnected, integrated nature of our economy. After all, our cooperation links are more strongly developed than in the EEC. Finances and the money supply only reflect this, and should stimulate it.

The conceptual decisions that have been formulated must be rapidly put into practice in a package of concrete measures, and if necessary further work and thought should be devoted to them, so that they can be submitted to the Federation Council in the next few days. Today we must be clearly answerable to ourselves. There is no getting away from the market, we must enter it together and extricate ourselves from the crisis together—that is the only way! Nobody is trying to outsmart anyone here, and it is simply not possible to outsmart economics. The main thing is constantly to move forward and to remember: Time will not wait!

Nobody in mankind's history has ever succeeded in restoring the commodity-money balance by popular measures, USSR First Deputy Prime Minister V.I. Shcherbakov said. But whenever unpopular decisions have to be made, the first thing that emerges is lack of understanding. Our economic system is flooded with money without any goods to buy with it. Unless we remedy this situation immediately, we will not succeed in restoring incentives for the development of production. The first deputy head of the Union Government presented an extensive list of specific measures whose objective is to restore the "commodity-money" link. In order to achieve this, he said, we will have to embark on unpopular measures.

Accords agreed within the framework of the preparation of the new Union treaty ensure an increase in the stability of the Union budget's income base, V.S. Pavlov said. It is necessary right now to find a way to use the consensus formula that has been achieved in order to impose order in the economy, food supplies, fuel supplies, and finances, the USSR prime minister went on. The threat hanging over the country must be resolutely diverted.

A decision was adopted on the expediency of preparing a draft economic agreement between the USSR and the sovereign republics for 1992.

Everything we have arrived at here must be translated to a practical footing, the USSR president stressed in conclusion.

Agriculture

Top Food Resource Official on Grain Procurement

PM1308142091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report on interview with M.L. Timoshishin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Purchases of Food Resources, by PRAVDA correspondent I. Totskiy—date, place not stated: "Will We Have Grain?—Everything Depends on How We Manage the Harvest and Procurements"]

[Text] People are like that: They are constantly worrying about whether or not they will have bread on the table. Moreover, not just today, but tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow. Of course, it is no accident that the editorial office often receives telephone calls and letters asking one and the same question: "Will we have bread?" PRAVDA's correspondent put this question to M.L. Timoshishin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Purchases of Food Resources.

Mikhail Lukich noted: Today, agricultural affairs are on everybody's mind. You know, we are all interested in how the grainfields have repaid the grain farmers' labor and what will be deposited in the storehouses. Many regions of the country, particularly in the East, have suffered drought.

On more than one occasion, the spring and summer weather forced unwanted changes in the work of farmers in the North Caucasus, the Ukraine, and the Chernozem center of the Russian Federation. Nevertheless, the harvest was protected. A good cereal crop was grown in Belorussia and in the Baltic Republics.

In short, there is grain in the fields. So it will end up on our table. Just how much, though, is another matter. Sufficient or... I don't want to look on the bad side. But you know, a lot depends on how the harvesting and procurement of grain are dealt with in the countryside. There are still substantial grounds for alarm here.

For example, everybody knows that practically the entire population of the country buys bread and other grain products baked from flour taken from the state resources. This is also the source of mixed feed provisions for all industrial livestock and poultry farming. Where will we get grain from once the state storehouses are empty? This is why the state order to farms has been set at a sale of 77 million tonnes of grain. So far, only 19 million tonnes have been delivered. What is particularly alarming is that the procurement rates over the last five-day period were significantly lower than in the previous one.

Of course, there are regions where farmers display a high sense of responsibility for providing the country with grain. For example, the grain farmers of Kalmykia fulfilled the order 106 percent. The sovkhozes and kolkhozes of Rostov Oblast, Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays, and the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] are successfully conducting grain sales to the state. However, over the country as a whole, the rate of grain deliveries is one-third to one-half lower than in the last three years. Maybe there is no grain at the threshing floors? You cannot say this. Farms in Donetsk, Zaporozhye, Kiev, Kherson, Cherkassy, and Chernigov Oblasts have sold just one-fifth of their threshed grain to the state. Over 1.1 million tonnes of it has remained on the farms of the Crimean Oblast, although here the grain farmers have fulfilled barely more than half of the state order.

Clearly, farms in Belgorod, Tambov, Penza and a number of other Russian Federation Oblasts are in no hurry to dispatch their grain. In Voronezh Oblast, for example, 2.7 million tonnes of grain have been threshed and just 537,000 tonnes sold to the state; in Samara Oblast, of 1.5 million tonnes of grain threshed a mere 186,000 tonnes have been sold to the state; and in Orenburg Oblast the figures read 1.8 million tonnes and 430,000 tonnes respectively.

The picture is similar in the Kazakh SSR. Take the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Alma-Ata and Taldy-Kurgan Oblasts for example. After completing the cereal harvest, they did not even begin the sale of grain to the state. Grain purchases in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan are progressing extremely unsatisfactorily.

No doubt there is a degree of fear in the localities: If we sell our grain to the state, what will we have left for ourselves? I must explain that all the grain purchased in the Union republics (apart from Kazakhstan) is kept to supply the local population and to be made into mixed feed.

This year, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, and a number of other republics introduced additional incentives aimed at increasing grain sales to the state.

Now, up to 30 percent of grain purchased as part of the state order can be paid for at contract prices. Grain sales to the state over and above the plan are purchased in freely convertible currency at world market prices. Whereas 0.3 million tonnes of grain and oilseeds were bought from farms for hard currency in 1989, last year this figure reached 2.8 million tonnes. Those who received hard currency in exchange for grain had the chance to use it at their discretion to acquire equipment and other goods.

This year, significantly more material resources and consumer goods have been allocated for barter sales to farms. It is recommended that prior to 1 October 1991 the following items be channeled into barter sales (at state wholesale and retail prices) to farms providing grain in excess of the state order: one month's norm (August 1991) of heavy and light vehicles, excavators, motor graders, motorized cranes, refrigerators, washing and sewing machines, knitted and sewn goods, footwear, construction materials, coal, and other consumer goods and material-technical resources.

Peasants constantly reproach us: Don't think you can fool us at whim! It has happened before—they promised to pay for above-plan grain with scarce goods and machinery. And where are they? It is true that we did not manage to settle up fully with kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Last year, all resources allocated by the government for barter sales were transferred to the republics. Unfortunately, a proportion of these resources (around 3 percent) were not delivered by the manufacturing plants, and a further proportion were not used as designated. As a result, some farms did not receive them. This undermines confidence in the decisions taken. This year, all goods earmarked for barter sales are allocated directly to grain producing associations and enterprises, and farms will receive them from there.

The predicted gross grain harvest allows for the country's demand for wheat, rye, and groats (apart from rice) to be met. It must all go into the state resources, as only then can we guarantee a steady supply of grain products to the population until the next harvest. And you know, the industrial livestock, poultry, and fish farming system needs the state resources too.

For their benefit, there are proposals to set up in each republic the necessary reserves of barley, pulse crops, and especially corn. Not forgetting, meanwhile, procurements of succulent and coarse feed and grass meal.

We should manage the grain which remains on farms for feeding purposes more efficiently. It would be more expedient to hand it over to state resources in exchange for mixed feed. Such an exchange is now beneficial for farms, as a USSR Cabinet of Ministers decision means mixed feed is being produced at prices which are 30 percent lower on average.

So will we have bread? I can answer PRAVDA's readers: we will. If the ripened harvest is gathered in its entirety and without losses, and if all those involved in the harvest and storage processes recognize one simple traditional truth: It is not the grain in the fields that counts, but the grain in the storehouses.

Stavropol Oblast Raises Prices for Bread-Grain

LD1308185491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 11 Aug 91

[Text] Farms in Stavropol oblast are to raise prices for bread-grain sharply in the near future. Nikolay Shebalkov, our correspondent, speaks about the reasons.

[Shebalkov] The prices for Stavropol oblast's bread-grain will at least triple. The decision has just been adopted by the economic service of the kray Agropromsoyuz. It is not difficult, of course, to guess why it made this decision. It is known that prices for all the industrial production destined for the countryside have skyrocketed, while the state purchase prices for grain, meat, and other agricultural products remain the same, strictly controlled. That is, they do not make it possible for state and collective farms to compensate for the losses.

Prices at exchanges have gone up several-fold. Buyers from those regions which experience acute food shortages have already become frequent visitors to Stavropol oblast. They are prepared to pay five to six times more for Stavropol's wheat. Naturally, the higher the prices for bread-grain, the better for the farms. On the other hand, the prices cannot go up indefinitely. A certain limit must be set here. Therefore, before charging these high prices for bread- grain, the Stavropol Agropromsoyuz has asked agricultural economists to carry out the relevant calculations and to make proposals. And one of the conditions of the Agropromsoyuz was that an optimum purchase price should be such as to maintain the profitability of production at a level around 30 percent.

The price of a ton of ordinary wheat is 1,000 rubles [R], of valuable wheat R1,200 and of strong wheat R1,500. Well, it is too early to regard these prices as accepted because, in my view, these prices will be changing.

Commentary Views CPSU's Agrarian Policy

PM1408090091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Aug 91 Union Edition p 2

[Article by M. Petrov: "On the Party's Influence on Livestock Weight Gain and Milk Yields"]

[Text] "The CPSU's agrarian policy at the present time" was how the subject of the press conference held at the CPSU Central Committee press center in the Oktyabrskaya Hotel was billed. Ye. Stroyev, secretary of the Central Committee, V. Chernoivanov, USSR minister of agriculture and food, and Academician B. Poshkus, vice president of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, answered journalists' questions.

Strictly speaking the processes going on today in the economy's agrarian sector can hardly be called the Communist Party's agrarian policy. They are its policy's consequences. But now the CPSU has, as we know, renounced the role of "leading and guiding force." And, thank God, it is not the Politburo which sets the peasants the task of bringing their daily livestock weight gains up to the European average, and indicates to them the principal route to achieve this aim. Secondly, politics is always action. But it is here that the party is in a tight spot as, incidentally, it was in the past. And declarations, appeals, and promises cannot rid it of this: It is something real. Realistic and (what is very important) decisive steps to raise the level of the country's agriculture and to improve food supply to the population are for the moment only in the draft of the party's new program which has been put forward for discussion.

The problem is what to consider as the party's agrarian policy. For example, in an interview published the other day in SELSKAYA ZHIZN N. Vorobyev, first secretary of Pytalovskiy party raykom [rayon committee], who is known for the transformations he has wrought in the countryside, proves convincingly on the basis of actual experience that if the kolkhozes and sovkhozes are not reformed immediately, an economic crash is inevitable. This means that there will be no hope for the food problem to be resolved quickly. Therefore, N. Vorobyev puts forward as one of his raykom's primary tasks the all-around promotion of the reform of production and property relations and the development of private farming, which will allow management efficiency to be raised quickly. Those are a party leader's views which are being implemented very successfully in practice.

Other Communists have different views. For example, N. Volodin, Ye. Stroyev's current successor in the post of first secretary of Orel CPSU Obkom [oblast committee], comes out against privatization publicly, scaring the public with the idea of society being rapidly and unavoidably divided into rich and poor. And it is entirely natural that the agrarian transformations in the oblast were markedly slowed down with Ye. Stroyev's departure. So what have we here? Is this also the party's policy?

Ye. Stroyev acquainted journalists with the basic provisions of the new party program's agrarian section. However, there is, frankly speaking, almost nothing in them which is in principle new.

There is for example the task of ensuring the reform of the agrarian economy and promoting the introduction of a mixed economy. But this is no longer a novelty but a fact which has come to pass. What is more, a fact which has come to pass most often in spite of the party's work in the rural heartland. According to Ye. Stroyev's information there are now 70,000 peasant and family farms in the USSR. Maybe it is no bad thing that the party is now prepared to fight for equal starting opportunities for farmers, cooperatives, and kolkhozes and competition between them, and is ready to assist all of them equally. Though there's no two ways about it—it is easier to fight for what is already won.

Here is another of the future program's provisions. The party intends to change its investment policy in agriculture and retool the processing sectors. And this will happen, word of honor. But all of this is the state's, the government's concern, not that of a political party, even a ruling party. Surely people realize by now that the time when the CPSU really was the party in the driving seat is past and will not return.

However let me remind you: In that period which was not so long ago the party was trying to resolve similar tasks. And what came of this is well known.

Here is a very recent example. In 1987 when the party was still "steering" the economy, 169 production lines were bought from West Germany to produce soft margarine, crackers, cheeses and the like. Almost all of them have already arrived in our country. The only thing is that only 55 of them are working. Will the adoption of the party's new program help to commission all the others in the shortest possible time? Hardly... For some reason people have more faith in their sale by auction to those who are prepared to begin their installation tomorrow (as is noted in Point 8 of the recent USSR Presidential Decree), than in the effectiveness of the party's new program.

Here is one more nonsense. Lamenting the fact that due to the absence of price parity for agricultural and industrial output the agricultural complex will make losses amounting to many billions, the CPSU Central Committee secretary reported that this question had been included in the agenda of the next Central Committee Secretariat session. But yet again, what is the use of the Secretariat here? Is it possible that without its verdict the Cabinet of Ministers (which, incidentally, is composed entirely of Communists) does not know what trouble has been caused in the economy by the free-for-all with prices and the primitive barter system which is flourishing due to the collapse of the state financial system? It was the government—formed, incidentally, by the ruling party—which destroyed both this system and the parity. Is it now necessary for this party's leading organs to pretend that they are actively searching for, but simply cannot find the culprits?

From everything that has been said, you get the impression that the CPSU continues to be hostage to the old, outmoded conceptions about its role and place in society. Hostage to those selfsame approaches, that style of activity which led us up a blind alley. Perhaps the most convincing example of this is the following. Over the two hours of the press conference, not one of its participants even once pronounced the words "private land ownership." Although much was said, in detail, about the necessity "to bring the peasant close to the means of production and the fruits of his labor." Meanwhile, there is only one method of doing this which has been tried and tested throughout the world. It involves giving the peasant, without clamor, possession of the land itself and what he produces on it.

You see, the essence of agrarian reforms lie in this today. And the devil take the rest.

Scientific

'Stage-Two' Mir Station Plans Discussed

917Q0146A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Aug 91 First edition p 4

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel A. Dolgikh: "Let Me Introduce You to 'Mir Stage Two'"]

[Text] **Rumors have begun to circulate recently that the Mir orbiting complex is an unprofitable installation, that it may incur losses, and that it does not "have too long to live." Doubts are being cast on the prospects for our space program, which has already been experiencing a cruel shortage of money. As a result, what was created over the decades by the unbelievable efforts of our fellow countrymen may ultimately perish.**

But all the same, is everything aboard the Mir as bad as some people would have us believe? I recently visited the Salyut Design Bureau of the NPO [scientific-production association] of Experimental Machinebuilding, which since February 1970 has been engaged in the development of long-term orbital stations (DOS). I met with designers and planners. Naturally I was interested in learning what kind of prospects exist for our long-term orbital stations. I think that everything I learned will be of some interest to our readers.

Thus, the first five Salyut vehicles (the first generation of long-term orbital stations) had a single docking assembly and a relatively short service life. The second-generation vehicles (the Salyut-6 and Salyut-7) had two docking assemblies, and the present Mir vehicle (third generation) has six. As a result it has been possible to "build" a complex, multipurpose station in space that is unique in terms of purpose. And today such a station has been created.

The Mir orbital complex, which inherited its name from the basic module, is equipped with various space apparatuses. These are primarily the Kvant and the Kvant-2 and the Kristall. The experienced reader can easily find them on the accompanying illustration. I should note, however, that not everything shown in that illustration is yet in place. In 1992 the Spektr should be docked (the T-shaped appendage below with the solar batteries), and in 1993 the Priroda (the item on the right with the long corrugated battery).

Alas, today there are no mechanisms that last forever, hence the need to conduct regular checks on the operation of the systems. Equipment grows old and wears out and so the cosmonauts must not only conduct experiments, but also carry out repair and renovation work. There is a basis for extending the life of particular assemblies and mechanisms on the station until 1992. However, even the new that replaces the old does not always meet the stringent "space" requirements, so to speak. And this occurs frequently. When economic links are broken, and even the economy itself, there can be no other result.

It is proposed that the Mir will operate until 1994. By that time it will have been in orbit eight years and will require replacement. Work is now underway at the Salyut design bureau and the Energiya NPO to develop a "second-stage" Mir. Outwardly it will differ little from its predecessor. But inside, new equipment will be installed, first and foremost a powerful heat-control system. The fact is that when two or three people are working in space simultaneously everything operates normally, but as soon as two crews "move in" the heat control simply "starts to gasp for breath." The temperature and humidity rise, and this leads to malfunctions. It is also proposed that the new station will have a more powerful computer and gyrodynes that will stabilize the station in a given position. There will undoubtedly be new models of special equipment. In particular it is proposed to install improved technological units to manufacture bioactive substances, biocrystals, semiconductors, and optical glasses. In this way the next step will be taken toward creating orbital factories.

Now, as to how what is planned will be implemented. There are two scenarios. The first is to use the Buran. It will go into orbit, "pick up" the second-stage Mir, which will then already be in space undergoing test checks, and dock it on the nose of the old Mir. Then, with the aid of a manipulator two or three modules (whichever are selected) will be docked with the new Mir. After that, several Progress vehicles will undock the modules whose service life has ended and will de-orbit them into the ocean at a given point.

The second scenario envisages the creation of a station similar to the first-stage Mir, which in the experts' opinion is less expensive and more reliable.

So we can see that the work of space exploration continues here even though there are major problems. Alas, many promising avenues are being closed off in the sphere of space exploration. Funding is being cut back constantly. It is clear where this will lead: to loss of priorities, and with this not only the country's prestige but also major hard currency earnings. In the United States, Japan, France, and a number of other countries, rigorous work is now underway to develop long-term orbital stations, and enormous sums of money are being spent on it. It is the opinion of foreign experts that orbital stations are capable of generating colossal earnings when used rationally. In the not-too-distant future the Americans, in cooperation with their European partners, will be placing their own "home" in orbit—the Freedom station. It will be a kind of analogue to the Mir.

Progress M-8 To Separate From Mir 15-16 Aug

LD1408103591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Text] The mission of the spaceship Progress M-8 as part of the piloted complex Mir is coming to an end. All the operations planned to be carried out with the space cargo ship have almost been fulfilled. The separation of the spaceship from the station will take place during the night of 15-16 August.

Space Center Extends Cosmonaut's Stay in Orbit

LD1408095291 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 14 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow August 14 TASS—Soviet Space Flight Engineer Sergey Krikalev will not leave the Mir orbiting station with Anatoliy Artsebarskiy after they complete their mission in October, the Soviet space centre says.

Artsebarskiy and Krikalev have been working on-board the station for almost three months.

The launch of the tenth main expedition with a Soviet-Austrian crew is scheduled for October 2, 1991. The first crew consists of Aleksandr Volkov, Takhtar Aubakirov from Kazakhstan and Franze Viehboeck from Austria. Aleksandr Viktorenko, Talgat Musabayev from Kazakhstan and Clemens Lothaller from Austria are on the stand-by crew.

Artsebarskiy will return to earth with Kazakh and Austrian cosmonauts after a week of joint work on-board the station. It is not clear as yet who will replace him. The state commission will disclose the name of the cosmonaut before the flight.

This is the first time that a crew includes two space researchers. The space centre says the decision to combine a Soviet-Austrian commercial flight and a planned expedition with a Kazakh space researcher has been prompted by the need to economise funds.

Military

Yazov Denies START Destroys Strategic Balance

OW1308154891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1440 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Report by diplomatic correspondent Petr Vasiliyev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The USSR Minister of Defence, Dmitriy Yazov, stated that the present version of the START Treaty, signed at the Moscow Summit, does not destroy the strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. In an interview with the newspaper, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, the minister said that there were several stories going around to the effect that the given agreement was not advantageous to the Soviet Union. He described the stories as fantastic.

At the time of the Moscow Summit "DP" [Diplomatic Panorama] published an interview with the former USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, Eduard Shevardnadze, in which he accused the military of dragging their feet in work on the agreement. "All of the basic and most complex problems regarding the treaty were resolved in the course of our negotiations with the Secretary of State in Houston during the meeting of the two presidents in Paris," he declared. "This includes problems connected with conventional weapons and strategic offensive weapons."

Mr. Shevardnadze described the subsequent complications as "artificial", arising only because the military wanted to "renegotiate" aspects of the treaty that had already been agreed upon, suggesting that they could force more concessions from the Americans. But, he continued, all their subsequent trips to Washington (i.e. the two trips of the USSR chief of Staff, General Mikhail Moiseyev) came to nothing. "They achieved nothing and returned to the same positions we had reached earlier. And in many aspects of the treaty they even made matters worse, by signing the treaty in conditions that were less advantageous to us. But the most important thing is that the treaty was signed. It is also good news that the impediments standing in the way of an agreement on conventional weapons have also been removed. These too arose artificially, thanks to the whims of some of our comrades," said Mr. Shevardnadze. And he singled out the military for special mention.

Furthermore, it was revealed to "DP", that during his meeting with Eduard Shevardnadze on the eve of the Moscow Summit, Secretary of State James Baker expressed regret that completion of the work on the START Treaty was delayed. Mr. Baker said that the delay had given the American right powerful ammunition in their campaign against the present administration and its attempts to normalise relations with the USSR. Their philosophy is that "you can't trust the Soviets, you can't do business with them". This ammunition was given them by the Soviet military, who started "redesigning" the agreed parameters of the START Treaty immediately after a series of unsuccessful attempts to work through several clauses of the treaty on conventional weapons.

Having arrived in Washington, General Moiseyev gave us a lecture on the necessary composition of the START Treaty. It felt as if somebody was trying to pull my tooth out, four days of agony, said Secretary of State Baker, according to one of the diplomats present at the Baker-Shevardnadze meeting.

Sergey Tarasenko, Mr. Shevardnadze's former assistant and now a member of the board of the Soviet Foreign Policy Association, told a "DP" correspondent that "after Houston the military accused us of weakening the Soviet Union's strategic position. But in the START Treaty just signed there are no new initiatives whatsoever."

Of the military's attempts to redesign the agreement, he said, "they simply were not prepared, they did not believe they would have to make any arms reductions".

"When in Reykjavik agreement was reached on the preparation for a treaty cutting nuclear weapons by 50 percent, the structure of armed forces and their future development should have been planned in advance. After all, strategic arms negotiatioins have been going on for ten years now," continued Tarasenko. "If they were hoping for a positive outcome the military should have thought about this from the very beginning. They should have worked towards a decrease of levels, planned reductions in strategic forces, in their numercial composition. This did not occur".

Yazov's Post May Go To RSFSR Representative

91UM0829A Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Aug 91 p 2

[Article by Vadim Grishin: "Should Marshal Yazov Retire? This Is Indicated by the Logic of the Novo-Ogarevo Processes"]

[Text] The unexpected appearance of the USSR defense minister at the recent meeting of the "10" at Novo-Ogarevo is proof of the serious concern among the leadership of the military department, which long since moved to a process of dividing powers between the center and the republics. According to information from reliable sources, what was discussed at the dacha near Moscow was the question of the possible formation of a new Union Government in which the individual ministerial posts would be underwritten by particular republics. In this case, the post of defense minister would, by the logic of things, have a greater chance of being assigned to a representative of the Russian Federation, and then the retirement of Yazov would be inevitable. The marshal's misgivings are undoubtedly being fed by the consultations that took recently in Kiev between four republics (the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Uzbekistan) on a unified concept for security and the foundations on which to build the Union armed forces. As the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Security Committee, Sergey Stepanin, emphasized, here in Kiev the question of creating republic armies was not raised. No doubts were cast on the principle of a unified operational leadership for the Armed Forces of the USSR. There was discussion of the participation of the republics in future military reform, and the range of powers that should remain with the center in accordance with the draft Union treaty should be transferred to the sphere of Union-republic competence or handed over entirely to the republics. The meeting in the Ukrainian capital was attended by two representatives of the General Staff delegated by General Moiseyev personally. The USSR Supreme Soviet declined to participate in the discussion even though it had received an invitation, addressed to Leonid Sharin, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and Security Affairs Committee.

Thus, the "ice has also been broken" in this very reserved and deeply echeloned sphere of residual influence of the administrative command system. The process of sovereignization in the republics has raised point blank the question of the need to reform the USSR Armed Forces. It is probably obvious to everyone that if the present leading structures are preserved there can be no reform in the Army. The highest organ of the Ministry of Defense—the collegium, made up of the minister and his deputies—will defend the status quo to the last. Unfortunately, the interests, both personal and departmental, of the leadership of the Armed Forces themselves are not only raising obstacles on the paths of military reform but can also threaten the entire Novo-Ogarevo process. Yugoslavia's bitter experience offers us a serious warning in this regard.

In order to really reflect the policy of the Union now being formed, the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Defense should probably be made up of empowered representatives from the republics. In turn, the policy agreed by the republics in the military field should be the guarantee of domestic and foreign stability. Then there will be no need for power methods in the draft and the holding out of hands when the military budget is being formed. There will also be a quite different approach to interethnic conflicts. Obviously, conversion will finally be moved from dead center. The archaic policy of the USSR Ministry of Defense in the sphere of military production is blocking all serious plans to switch the defense people onto civilian rails. They are saying that it was pressure from the military that prevented Gorbachev from announcing in London specific steps to attract foreign capital for the conversion of 400 defense enterprises. In this context the desperate act by the Ukraine to transfer enterprises of the military-industrial complex located on its territory to republic jurisdiction is quite understandable. Given the present state of affairs, a similar step is probably inevitable in Russia also. The center is trying to oppose these trends, and with the approval of the Ministry of Defense is gambling on scenarios of excessive centralization of the military-industrial complex and bringing it under the direct subordination of the vice president of the USSR. In turn, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has circulated in the republics the documents discussed in Kiev. In the event that they are approved, the "nine" can stake everything at the local level.

Students Threaten Strike Over Military Draft

LD1308202791 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Veronika Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow August 13 TASS—Students' negative attitude to the bill on compulsory military service in the USSR Armed Forces has assumed a quite definite form—a students' strike committee began operating in Moscow. Under Article six of the bill, all students suspend their studies for two years and go to serve in the Army if they are under 27.

The military put forth the following arguments to shore up the bill: First, it is claimed that the present deferment for students violates the equality of the rights of workers, peasants and students. Second, half a million students need to be called up to offset dwindling turnouts at Soviet draft boards.

Members of the Moscow Club of Intellectuals has recently adopted an appeal to the public saying that "the military establishment is launching an offensive on the culture of our homeland. A break in the education of young people aged between 18 and 20 perniciously affects the development of would-be scientists, engineers, teachers and cultural personalities.

The students' strike committee demands that the USSR Defence Ministry be mindful of the public opinion in making such important decisions. "Our goal is the real reform of the army," Nikolay Pakhomov, a member of the committtee, told TASS.

The students' strike committee, which has ten people on its staff, is now forging contacts with educational establishments in various parts of the country. "The programme of our actions includes interviews for the press, the issue of leaflets and the staging of pickets to demand that people's deputies take into account students' point of view," Pakhomov went on.

"If these activities fail to produce a result, we will pass over to street actions and then to strikes—hundreds of thousands of students will cease to attend classes," Pakhomov said.

Senior Officers Urge End of Student Deferment

91UM0827A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 First Edition p 1

[Article by Army General N. Lyashchenko, Army General A. Shcheglov, and Navy Admiral N. Sergeyev: "There Is Much Ado, But Is There Any Sense?"]

[Text] The sixth, regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will discuss the draft law on compulsory military enlistment and military service. LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, KURANTY, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, and some other publications printed certain materials in this connection which support the student enlistment deferment. Moreover, all arguments in the defense of the deferment cancellation are labeled by them as demagoguery, a meaningless and immoral talk.

One cannot but feel concerned with this kind of categorical statement. We would expect that a dialog concerning this problem be conducted in a respectful manner and only facts be used as the basis for the exchange of opinions. But the authors of these articles do not think so, even in those cases where they present really serious claims. Among other things, they are consistently talking about the perilous effect of the military service on the budding talents of our future scientists, engineers, teachers, and workers of culture. But at the same time they do not give any proof of it.

The military service always helped students to develop also. They became more mature and more responsible for their actions. Their military experience helped them to overcome the obstacles in their everyday life at a later stage, to find a common language with their workmates. There are examples of a different nature, of course, as there are shortcomings in the military units themselves. But we should not arrive at such broad general conclusions based on separate incidents.

Let us talk about another important issue, that of social protection. The enlistment of students together with other young people fully complies with this requirement. All people in our country have equal opportunities and obligations. The opportunities may be used in accordance with one's abilities, wishes, financial status, and other circumstances but the obligations are the same for everyone.

Is it fair to extend privileges to some categories of people in this case? It definitely is not, but everything looks different in practice. This may be seen, for instance, from the analysis of our present-day army personnel. Every young man has both the right and the opportunity to enter any higher education establishment, with no preferential treatment for anyone. But for some reason however, those young people who have parents in high positions or have connections or have a lot of money also get more of those opportunities. Can this be the main reason for the uproar in our press about the student enlistment?

All this allows us to say: There should be no exceptions for any category of young people when they are drafted into the Armed Forces. Every person should honor his constitutional duty in due time.

It is a different matter that the term of the military service can be made dependent on the serviceman's progress. If he is expeditious in acquiring military skills and is also conscientious and well-disciplined, the term of his military service can be reduced. Incidentally, that was our practice once, in the early 1930's. We had special qualifications platoons organized of well- versed and diligent soldiers and sergeants. The term of service in them was only one year.

Other solutions are possible. The most important thing is to let common sense dominate when these solutions are considered and put into practice.

MVD Units Hold Exercises at Nuclear Plant

OW1308160891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1420 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Leningrad units of the troops of the Ministry of the Interior of the USSR, the Baltic Fleet, the Leningrad Regional department of the KGB and border guard units have had four-day exercises near the Leningrad nuclear power station.

This is the first time that such a large-scale training operation to defend a nuclear power station has been carried out in the Soviet Union.

According to the press centre of the Leningrad City Administration for the Interior, the aim of the exercises was to learn to carry through measures to eliminate the consequences of subversvie acts and other extraordinary situations.

Exercise supervisors have said that the Ministry of the Interior troops have displayed "adequate skills", but that it has become obvious that the station has inadequate air and sea defences.

Estonia

Ruutel Issues Statement on Baltic Independence

OW1408013291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1920 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The chairman of the Estonian Supreme Council, Mr. Arnold Ruutel made a statement on August 13 on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Atlantic Charter signed by President Franklin Roosevelt of the United States and Prime-Minister Winston Churchill of the United Kingdom on August 14, 1991.

The statement says that the Charter called for the restoration of independence for all occupied countries.

Mr. Ruutel points out that the majority of the countries occupied during the war time have regained their independence. However, he says, we should not think that the consequences of World War II are put to rest until Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania regain their independence. He believes it will be made possible only with an active help from the world public opinion.

"We attach a special importance", the statement says, "to a more active role by the United Nations in the realisation of the principles contained in the Atlantic Charter which have not yet been realised".

Soviet, Estonian Prime Ministers Meet in Moscow

OW1308102291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1000 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] BF [BALTFAX] has been informed at the Estonian Mission in Moscow that the Soviet and Estonian premiers, Valentin Pavlov, and Edgar Savisaar, had a meeting in Moscow this morning.

Savisaar Says Meeting 'Fruitful'

OW1308141491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1330 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Estonia's Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar has described his meeting with the USSR Premier Valentin Pavlov in Moscow on Tuesday as "an ordinary working meeting" and a "fruitful one."

Speaking to newsmen upon his return to Tallinn, E. Savisaar said he had met with V. Pavlov 4 times this summer, and that this "process of serious negotiations" should be expected to yield a number of documents, including an Estonian-Soviet agreement on trade and economic cooperation for 1992. According to the Estonian premier, his republic will be among the first to sign such an agreement with the USSR.

E. Savisaar said he had also met in Moscow with the ex-Vice Premier of Russia, and currently President Yeltsin's adviser on the affairs of the federation and constituent territories, Yuriy Skokov, who quoted B. Yeltsin as saying that this year's economic agreement between Russia and Estonia would be valid also after the RSFSR signed the new Union treaty.

More on Meeting With Pavlov

LD1308154391 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1400 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar met Valentin Pavlov, USSR prime minister, this morning. By 1300 Edgar Savisaar was back in Tallinn. Savisaar expressed the opinion that, evidently, Estonia will succeed—among the first to do so—in concluding an economic contract with the USSR for 1992. Such hopeless matters like saving the ruble were not discussed with Pavlov, Edgar Savisaar said. The Estonian prime minister did not wish to comment on the meeting with Pavlov at any length. He said that first and foremost we will have to wait until 20 August when the signing of the Union treaty begins. According to Savisaar an agreement was made with Pavlov also in respect of subsequent meetings.

While in Moscow Savisaar met also Yuriy Skokov, Boris Yeltsin's deputy in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] council, who assured him that when Russia signs the Union treaty, the economic and trade treaty between the Republic of Estonia and the RSFSR will remain fully in force.

Meeting With Soviets Scheduled for 16 Aug

OW1408013191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1920 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A meeting between Soviet and Estonian delegations in Moscow scheduled for August 16 will be held as planned, BF [BALTFAX] has been told by the press-centre of the Estonian Supreme Council. The meeting has been called into question since the Estonians have been reluctant to attend it unless the USSR agrees to discuss historical and legal aspects of the events which took place in 1939-1940. Presently Tallinn has received a confirmation from Moscow that it is prepared to discuss historical and legal issues along with economic ones.

Mr. Indrek Toome, a member of the Estonian delegation, told BF that the last week's meeting of economics experts succeeded in resolving practically all economic issues.

A meeting of experts in historical and legal issues is to take place in Moscow on August 15.

Economic Agreement Discussions Set for 19 Aug

OW1408021091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1920 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The deputy chief of the Estonian mission in Moscow, Mr. Kalju Muurisepp [name as received], has told BF [BALTFAX] that special delegations of Estonia and the USSR will meet in Moscow on August 19 to discuss an economic agreement for 1992. This meeting was agreed upon on August 13 when Soviet prime-minister Valentin Pavlov met his Estonian counterpart, Mr. Edgar Savisaar, he added.

Mr. Edgar Savisaar told a BF correspondent on August 13 that Estonia seemed to be the first "non-aligned" republic to conclude such an economic agreement with the USSR.

Parliament Blocks Gorbachev Union Treaty Appeal

LD1308123391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 13 Aug 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia has opened in Tallinn. The Parliament of the republic refuses to examine the proposal by Russian-speaking deputies to discuss the appeal by the USSR president to the republic Parliaments in connection with the signing of the Union treaty.

Republic Government Endorses Job Contracts Law

LD1308112991 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 12 Aug 91

[Report by Mati Kirotar on Estonian Government session in Toompea on 12 August]

[Excerpts] The session was chaired today by Jaak Leimann, minister of the economy. First the draft law on employment contracts was examined. It is also the first in a package of employment laws that are now being prepared. [passage omitted] Arvo Kuddo, minister of social issues, spoke about the draft law on employment contracts in more detail at a post-session news conference.

[Begin Kuddo recording] We are talking here not only of a draft law, but also of a conceptually new approach to the employment law altogether and to the use of the work force as a whole. [passage omitted] The relations—let us say—between the employer and the employee have not been legally regulated. Here we have included much of the experience of international law; there has been much familiarization with suggestions and proposals from an international labor organization, and I think this constitutes a step forward in truly becoming a part of Europe also in the sphere of employment law. [end recording]

The government endorsed the draft law on employment contracts at its first reading today. It will be handed over to the Supreme Soviet for examination by 1 September. [passage omitted]

Latvia

Dimanis Expects 'Tension' To Rise in Republic

LD1308205391 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondents Valeriy Zaytsev and Andrey Sidorin]

[Text] Riga August 13 TASS—"The relative political calmness and lower tension in Latvia this summer are fragile," Sergey Dimanis, leader of the parliamentary group Ravnopraviye (Equality), told TASS. He thinks that tension may rise again in the republic due to serious economic difficulties, increased political activity by wide sections of the population and moves to kindle nationalist passions as was the case in January, 1991.

Dimanis said this alternation of calmness with deliberate moves to escalate tension was part of the general strategy of the Latvian Popular Front's leaders. Workers, farmers and a considerable part of youth become increasingly dissatisfied with the new authorities' policy. The forced privatisation of large profitable farms and the land reform generate great concern with peasants for their future.

Former proprietors and their heirs filled such a vast number of applications asking to return their land that they simply cannot be satisfied physically. All this brings about a situation where the support of the new authorities by farmers, who actually formed the present Latvian Parliament, is dwindling.

One cannot ignore either the sentiments of Russian-speaking residents who make up the majority of work collectives at major industrial plants (the non-indigenous population in Latvia amounts to 48 per cent). Once they intensify their political activity, the situation in the republic will, on the whole, change sharply because the present authorities are absolutely unprepared to conduct a dialogue with them.

Simultaneously, illusions about the West's aid are being rapidly dispelled. At first, it seemed to some politicians that if Latvia helps disintegrate the Union by seceding from it, the entire Western world will automatically rush to its aid. But when it turned out that Latvia is only a small piece in big politics, the revelation sparked a shock here," Dimanis said.

Baltic Military Staff Plan Exercises 15-25 Aug

LD1408123691 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0900 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Text] The Baltic Military District leadership reports that district staff will train on Latvian territory 15-25

August, during which the redeployment of personnel units and military equipment is envisaged.

Republic Highways To Be Guarded by Armed Police

OW1308202591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1530 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia's Interior Minister Alois Vaznis has told BF [BALTFAX] that armed police posts will appear in the near future on major motorways and along the republic's economic border to control crime and prevent the smuggling of stolen goods, weapons, etc.

Pro-USSR Deputies To Meet 17 Aug in Riga

OW1308201991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1530 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to the press center of the Latvian Communist Party's [LCP] Central Committee, deputies of all levels favoring the Baltic republics' stay within the USSR, including representatives of the parliamentary minorities in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, will meet in Riga on August 17 to discuss ways of safeguarding the rights of Soviet citizens, and to elect a coordinating council of the three Baltic republics.

On Monday, August 19, the LCP leader Alfred Rubiks will give a news conference at the party's Central Committee in Riga.

Riga Railway Station Customs Post Attacked

LD1308150891 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1300 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Last night there was yet another attack on one of our customs posts. As the duty officer of the public security department reports, during the night, at about 2340 [2040 GMT], the customs post at Riga railway station was attacked by six armed men, two in OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] uniform and four in civilian clothes. They broke down a door, knocked out windows, smashed up the premises, and beat up the customs officers.

Further on Attack

OW1308140691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1330 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The duty officer at the customs checkpoint of the railroad station in Riga has told BF [BALTFAX] that 6 persons (one wearing OMON [Special Purpose Milita Detachment] uniform and armed with a pistol, the rest in plain clothes) attacked the checkpoint at 23:40 on August 12, breaking the door and windows and beating up one of the customs servicemen. The checkpoint is again operative, the duty officer said.

Republic Prisons To Be Guarded By Special Force

OW1308151891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1330 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia's Interior Minister Alois Vaznis has told BF's [BALTFAX] reporter that his ministry will take on the guarding of the republic's prisons as of January 1992.

He said a letter from the USSR Interior Ministry had informed him that Soviet interior troops would cease guarding Latvia's corrective establishments as of January 1, unless they were paid 10 million rubles a year for that work. Besides, the republic would have to ensure the draft of young Latvians into the Soviet Army.

According to A. Vaznis, the guarding of Latvian prisons by Soviet interior troops would be "too costly a favor" from the USSR; it would be impossible to persuade young men from Latvia to serve in the Soviet armed forces. Besides, Soviet interior troops have guarded convicts on Latvian territory "with insufficient zeal." Hence the decision to set up a special force of Latvia's own for the purpose.

Lithuania

Commission Issues Statement on Medininkai Attack

LD1308213191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Statement by the Lithuanian government commission in charge of investigating the Medininkai border post incident and the explosion in Vilnius—read by announcer]

[Text] The Lithuanian government commission in charge of investigating the 31 July 1991 incident, in which the Lithuanian customs and police officials who were on duty at the Medininkai Border Protection Post were killed and wounded; and also in charge of investigating the circumstances of the explosion in Vilnius at 1 Sapiega Street, adjacent to the Soviet Military Unit 3404 headquarters, notes that representatives of the USSR Interior Ministry, KGB and Defense Ministry, in disregard of signed and verbal agreements, are not rendering actual assistance to the law protection organs of the Republic of Lithuania who are investigating the Medininkai murders.

Two weeks have passed since the event, but the above mentioned departments, despite promises, have not created conditions for the republic's order protection organs, to complete, even some preliminary urgent investigative procedures at the bases of the perpetrators of terror in the Baltic States—the Vilnius and Riga Special Purpose Militia Detachment Units, and at locations where other USSR bodies are located in Lithuania.

Therefore, the government commission is forced to state that the USSR leadership is consciously delaying and ruining the investigation and is not interested in objectively investigating the murders on 31 July at the Medininkai Border Protection Post.

At the same time the government commission is advising that the law protection institutions of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia and Estonia are helping as much as they can in the investigation of these murders.

Signed—Chairman of the Government Commission, Zigmas Vaisvila.

MVD Official Comments on Statement

LD1408092191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0740 GMT 14 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius, 14 Aug (TASS)—The Lithuanian Government commission investigating the tragic incident which occurred on the night of 31 July at the customs post in Medininkai has publicized another statement.

It claims, in particular, that "representatives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], the Committee for State Security, and the Defense Ministry of the USSR, despite written and verbal agreements, are not giving real assistance to the law and order bodies of the Lithuanian Republic in investigating the murder."

This claim is based on the fact that two weeks have passed since the incident, but the above-mentioned departments "despite their promises, have not created conditions even for the start of urgent actions by the republic's law-enforcement bodies to conduct investigations among the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] detachments of Vilnius and Riga."

The government commission's document, signed by Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Zigmas Vaisvila, concludes that "the USSR leadership is deliberately holding up the inquiry and is not manifesting any commitment to the murder investigation." The statement notes, however, that the law and order bodies of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia and Estonia are rendering real assistance in investigating the incident in question in accordance with their abilities.

Andrey Chernenko, a leading offical of the USSR MVD, said today in an interview with TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev, that "the statement of the Lithuanian government commission is lies, and has a clearly expressed propaganda nature." This action by Lithuanian political circles, according to Chernenko, "is directed at inflaming the situation around the investigation." As for the competent bodies of the republics, the USSR MVD representative added, "they have not sent a single official inquiry."

The USSR MVD, Andrey Chernenko stressed, proposes a meeting with its Lithuanian colleagues in front of television cameras for an open discussion of all issues linked to carrying out the investigation."

Further on Commission Statement

OW1408002391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1920 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A commission appointed by the Lithuanian Government to investigate the Medininkai murders, in which 7 Lithuanian customs officials and policemen were killed at a border crossing on the night of July 31, has said that representatives of the Interior Ministry, the KGB and the Defense Ministry of the USSR have not provided any real assistance to the Lithuanian law-enforcement bodies investigating the incident.

A statement signed by the commission's chairman, Vice Premier Sigmas Vaisvila, which was made public on August 13 stresses that two weeks have passed since the tragedy occurred but the said governmental bodies, despite their promises, have not created conditions for the Lithuanian law-enforcement bodies to take urgent preliminary actions at the bases of the Vilnius and Riga OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] unit and at other Soviet facilities in Lithuania.

"In this connection", the statement points out, "the governmental commission is forced to assume that the Soviet leadership has been deliberately delaying and derailing the investigation and is not interested in an objective inquiry into the murder" at the border crossing in Medininkai on August 31.

However, the commission said that the law-enforcement bodies of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia and Estonia were doing their utmost within their capabilities to help to investigate the tragedy.

Official Says OMON 'Hampering' Investigation

LD1308101191 Hamburg DPA in German 0937 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Vilnius (DPA)—Gedgaudas Norkunas, the deputy prosecutor general of Lithuania, has accused the Soviet OMON [special purpose militia detachment] anti-terror troop of hampering investigations into the Medininkai incident, where two weeks ago six Lithuanian officers were killed. Norkunas told DPA in Vilnius on Tuesday that the troop, which in fact comes under the Soviet Internal Affairs Ministry, even refused to support Moscow investigators in examining the incident.

So far it has refused to make its arms and vehicles available. The unit also was not prepared to hand over photographs of its soldiers in order to show these to witnesses. Furthermore, the unit failed to meet a request to come to the scene of the crime, Norkunas said. The prosecutor concluded from this that the Baltic OMON troops were under [the control of] the KGB, not the Soviet Internal Affairs Ministry.

Meanwhile, the condition of the sole survivor of the attack has improved only marginally. Lithuanian Health Minister Juozas Olekas said in reply to an inquiry that Tomas Sernas still could not be questioned. The investigators are hoping that Sernas' statement will yield concrete information about the perpetrators.

Butkevicius Denies Saying Victim Named OMON

LD1308124591 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius August 13 TASS—The chief of the Lithuanian Defence Department flatly denied today having told foreign news organisations that a critically injured customs official named federal OMON special operations forces as the killers responsible for the July 31 massacre in Medininkai in the Baltic republic.

"I did not make such claims to anyone," Audrius Butkevicius said in a telephone interview with TASS.

He confirmed that while recently in Sweden, he gave an interview there, in which he spoke, in particular, about OMON involvement in earlier attacks on Lithuanian customs posts.

"When speaking of the July 31 incident, however, I just said that an investigation is under way and that I will be able to provide any information only after it is over," Butkevicius explained.

He added that the question of who committed the crime will probably be answered soon, as a witness has survived.

Butkevicius insisted that in his interview in Sweden he said only the same, namely that there is a witness, who will give testimony, and that no specific culprits were mentioned.

TASS correspondent Yuriy Sizov in Moscow was able to find out from trustworthy sources, in the meantime, that communication with the only surviving witness, Tomas Sharnas, has as yet been limited to gesticulation, as he cannot talk to this day.

The only thing Sharnas can do when asked a question is to answer by slowly moving his head.

Republic Communists, OMON Urge Compromise

PM1308133691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Aug 91 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Stroganov report: "For Consolidation and Compromise"]

[Text] Vilnius—The plans of the Lithuanian organs of power which have become known to the republic's communists cannot but cause alarm: Some people very much want the situation to deteriorate. A statement of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat says: "The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat has reliable information that the repressive organs of separatist power in Lithuania, continuing Landsbergis' provocative policy, have decided from 9 August this year to conduct searches at the apartments of the Lithuanian Communist Party leadership and active communists. The pretext for this provocation is to look for evidence concerning the events of 13 January this year."

The question arises: If the powers that be in the republic really believe that communists were involved in the January events, why did they wait more than six months and have only now decided to look for "evidence"? A chain of events, prompted by poor logic, is forming: the tragedy at Medininkai; actions against the armed forces and OMON [special purpose militia detachment]; searches.... "The real reason for this provocation is to further whip up political tension and confrontation in the republic with a view to compromising the Lithuanian Communist Party, its activists, and its ordinary members," the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat statement says. In the republic, the Communist Party, the armed forces, and the OMON are all publicly declared to be the organizers of the tension. But it is not hard to see that the Lithuanian Communist Party is constantly calling on the republic's political forces to seek a compromise and find ways out of the critical situation.

This, for instance, is what the resolution of the recent Ninth Lithuanian Communist Party Plenum says: "Communists, remaining true to their ideological convictions, seek compromises with various political forces of a democratic orientation in order to pursue joint actions with them to overcome the crisis in the republic."

And here is an extract from a statement by the OMON command, which certain forces accuse of all the mortal sins: "We see the solution to the present crisis situation in talks among all Lithuania's political movements and the formulation of decisions acceptable to everyone. We are for consolidation and compromise."

However, no appeals for consensus or compromise can be heard from the "right." Their stance is radical and absolute. So who is whipping up the tension in the republic? And how will this logical chain end, according to the intentions of its unseen author?

Vilnius Black Berets Complain About Picketing

LD1308155691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] On Saturday several pickets accidentally entered the area around the occupied buildings of the Lithuanian Police Academy controlled by the Black Berets and disturbed some mines which exploded, spreading a cloud of smoke and firing out signal flares.

Meanwhile, the Russian News Agency reported today that the leaders of the Vilnius Black Berets reported to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] about an alleged incident during the picketing. According to their report, an unidentified person allegedly attempted to force his way into the territory of the Black Berets and fired several times in the direction of the troopers, who tried to detain him.

However, a representative of the Lithuanian MVD told Vilnius radio that the republic's police do not have any information about incidents during the picketing of the Black Berets' headquarters. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Reports on Republic's Weapons Fund

PM1308120991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Aug 91 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent Yu. Stroganov report: "Exacerbating Situation"]

[Text] Vilnius—The creation of a Lithuanian weapons fund, the official lack of confidence in the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], KGB, and Defense Ministry, the protest actions against the presence of OMON [special purpose militia detachment] on the republic's territory and, conversely, rallies in support of OMON—these are signs of the exacerbating situation.

The creation of the weapons fund by a government resolution is attributed to the need to strengthen the protection of borders, customs posts, and important installations, the traditions of the buildup of a weapons fund between the wars, and the public's initiative to donate their weapons for the protection of independence. According to the resolution, the fund will receive weapons and ammunition donated by the population and organizations, as well as money donated by the public for the protection of the state and the acquisition of weapons. The republic's General Prosecutor's Office has already called on the population to surrender to this fund all firearms, ammunition, and explosives in people's possession without proper permits. It is not hard to guess that the Medininkai tragedy, which is still being investigated and the culprits are yet to be identified, is exploited to the full by the republic's organs of power to discredit the relevant Union structures. They have identified the culprits without any investigation. A statement by the Lithuanian Republic government commission says that there are no grounds to believe the statement by the USSR MVD, KGB, and Defense Ministry about their noninvolvement in the Medininkai incident. And Lithuania's Prime Minister G. Vagnorius once more accused "conservative forces in the USSR" of creating tension. An active campaign along the same avenue is also waged by "Sajudis."

The investigative organs are still unable to give an answer to the question which torments the public: Who killed the people at the Medininkai customs post? There are rumors that the surviving but seriously wounded customs officer is trying to say something. I think that, in the prevailing situation, any word spoken by him against the country's Armed Forces or the OMON would be used to fan an anti-Soviet campaign. For the time being, however, the reports on his state of health are vague....

Official Says Arms Stockpile for 'Self-Defense'

LD1308151491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius, 13 Aug (TASS)—"The stockpiling of arms is not connected with any intentions of starting combat operations in Lithuania," Audrius Butkevicius, general director of the Department for the Defense of the Country, declared today at a briefing in the [Lithuanian] Republic's Supreme Soviet.

Commenting on the decision to set up a stockpile of weapons adopted by the government last week, the department head said the weapons were needed for people guarding the customs posts as a "deterrent and means of self-defense." At the same time he expressed regret that so far the fulfillment of the decision on arming the frontier posts was being held back.

The general director also announced that from September it was planned that a "Center of Nonviolent Resistance" would start operating in Lithuania, whose aim was to prepare organizers of nonviolent resistance and train economic and administrative bodies in case "the Soviet Union tries to introduce a stricter occupation regime.

Lithuania, Armenia To Sign Cooperation Treaty

OW1308101891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1000 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Supreme Council of Armenia, is coming to Vilnius today.

The purpose of his visit is the signing of a treaty on relations between the Republic of Armenia and the Lithuanian republic, which is to take place tomorrow.

Further on Intergovernmental Treaty

OW1408043591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1920 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Lithuania and Armenia will hold talks in Vilnius on August 14 and sign a treaty on inter-governmental relations between the Republic of Armenia and the Lithuanian Republic.

Lithuania has formed a delegation for the upcoming talks which includes Mr. Vytautas Landsbergis, the chairman of the republic's Supreme Council, vice-prime minister Zigmas Vaisvila, foreign and economics ministers, Messrs Algirdas Saudargas and Albertas Simenas respectively, and a number of other members of the Lithuanian Government, a BF [BALTFAX] correspondent reports.

According to the latest reports, the chairman of the Armenian Parliament, Mr. Levon Ter-Petrosyan who will head his republic's delegation will arrive in Vilnius on August 14.

The one-day visit's program includes a meeting with representatives of the Armenian community in Lithuania.

Republic Leaders Meet PRC Consular Officials

LD1308220491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] The Supreme Council chairman of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, today received diplomats from the People's Republic of China, Leningrad Consul-General (Wen Shengqian) and Consul (Duan Siqil). This is their first visit to Lithuania, following their appointment to these posts a month ago.

Vytautas Landsbergis described to his guests the Lithuanian people's struggle for independence and its consolidation, and reviewed the political struggle and economic situation in Lithuania. (Wen Shengqian) discussed the political, economic and legal reforms currently being carried out in China. Opinions were exchanged concerning possible developments in the Soviet Union.

(Wen Shengqian) and (Duan Siqi) were also received today by Lithuanian Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas. The PRC consul-general told an information and press section staff member at the Foreign Ministry that he came to the Baltic states to introduce himself, to pay his respects to the officials of these states, and to discuss some political and economic questions.

During the course of the exchange, the consul-general was informed about the Soviet military forces' actions in Lithuania, and on diplomatic and state relations with West and East European states. The consolidation of the independence of Lithuania, problems of international recognition and current relations with the Soviet Union, and also possible relations with the republics that will sign the Union treaty with the Soviet Union were also discussed.

More on Republic's Non-Violent Resistance Center

OW1308201491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1530 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Audrius Butkevicius, chief of Lithuania's National Security Department, told journalists in Parliament on Tuesday that a "non-violent resistance center" will open in the republic on September 1 to train department officers to organize non-violent resistance "in the event of the Soviet Union's attempt to toughen the occupation regime." According to A. Butkevicius, the center may offer special training also to administrators.

Mr. Butkevicius believes it is high time Lithuania defined its relations with the Soviet Union, as well as with the West, in the national security area.

Soldiers, Protesters Outside KGB Headquarters

AU1408120491 Paris AFP in English 1115 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow, Aug 14 (AFP)—A detachment of Soviet troops took up positions outside the KGB headquarters in Vilnius on Wednesday [14 August] as protesters demanding the withdrawal of the Soviet KGB from Lithuania continued to gather nearby, reporters there said.

Around a dozen armed soldiers were patrolling a perimeter around the building as several dozen demonstrators, some of them carrying placards bearing anti-Soviet slogans and others passing out anti-Soviet leaflets, assembled for the third consecutive day, they said.

Reports from Vilnius described the atmosphere as tense but controlled and said the protesters had agreed to demonstrate outside the KGB building on a daily basis for an indefinite period.

The posting of the troops came a day after a Lithuanian government commission accused the Soviet KGB state security policy and the Soviet Defense Ministry of failing to cooperate in the investigation of a border attack on July 31 which left seven Lithuanians dead.

The Lithuanian Government "is forced to assume that the Soviet leadership has been deliberately delaying and derailing the investigation and is not interested in an objective inquiry into the murders," the commission said in a statement reported by the unofficial news agency INTERFAX.

Lithuanian authorities have blamed the machinegun attack, which took place at the Medininkai crossing on the border with Belorussia, on the KGB and the crack Soviet police unit OMON, or "Black Berets." Both organizations have denied any involvement and have pledged to take part in a full investigation.

Separately, a Lithuanian official said Tuesday that a call to stockpile weapons in the republic was for the self-defense of Lithuanian people. "The piling of arms is not connected with any intentions to begin combat operations in Lithuania," Audrius Butkevicius, director-general of the Lithuanian Land Protection Department, said in remarks reported by the Soviet news agency TASS.

Yeltsin Meets Communist Party First Secretary

LD1308153191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1420 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow, 13 Aug (TASS)—There was a meeting today between Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], and Valentin Kuptsov, first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party [CP] Central Committee. During (?the meeting), which took place in a spirit of frankness and mutual understanding, the two sides exchanged opinions on the situation in the republic, on ways of overcoming the economic crisis and solving urgent social and political tasks, and on forms of cooperation between party organizations and state institutions at the republican and local levels, it was reported in the press center of the RSFSR CP Central Committee.

Valentin Kuptsov noted that the party is fully resolved to take an active part in the process of progressive reforms contributing to the renewal and rebirth of RSFSR society. It considers it an urgent task to prevent the collapse of the multinational Union state and integrated economic mechanism, and to strengthen law and order and legality. Under conditions of a profound restructuring of the economy and the gradual transition (?to market) relations, the communists aim to ensure reliable social protection for the workers and the stabilization of the consumer market. The Communist Party is ready to make use of its political and organizational potential in the interest of solving urgent economic and social problems, among others the successful completion of the harvest, the preparation of the economy for winter work, the expansion of construction of housing and social and cultural facilities, an increase in the level of health care, and other things.

There was discussion of the situation that has arisen in connection with the decree of the RSFSR president on departyization which is being examined in the USSR Constitutional Supervision Committee. The sides did not reach agreement regarding a suspension of the validity of the decree. But in explaining his position, Boris Yeltsin noted that the decree does not envisage any repressive violent actions against communists. It is not demanding an immediate, sharp break in the forms of activity of the RSFSR CP.

The two sides noted the importance of maintaining constant business contacts between the various links of the Supreme Soviet, RSFSR Council of Ministers, and the Communist Party of the republic. It was decided that meetings between the RSFSR president and the first secretary of the RSFSR CP Central Committee would be held regularly.

Yeltsin Defends Decision To Sign Treaty

LD1308145491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA recently carried an appeal to the president of Russia, whose authors, including Yelena Bonner, Yuriy Afanasyev, and other extremely respected compatriots of ours, cast doubt on the need for Russia to sign the new Union treaty on 20 August. Today NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA prints the reply from Boris Yeltsin, the president of the republic, to that message.

Boris Nikolayevich expresses his understanding of the worry of many Russians about to what extent the new Union treaty has taken on board everything positive that has been gained in the course of the democratic transformations, about to what extent it will enable a new step to be taken on the road to a free and prosperous society.

Boris Yeltsin admits that he does not feel very comfortable holding a dialouge via the newspaper with people so respected and well-known to him as the authors of the appeal are. A more apt form of discussion could have been found. Even my current full timetable would not pose an obstacle to a personal meeting, the president of Russia writes. I hope the authors of the appeal will not dispute this.

Nevertheless, Yeltsin thinks they had another purpose: to appeal to the democratic public to win over the president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] into refusing to sign the new Union treaty. It is no longer a question of a divergence of views. The question is a more than fundamental one. Upon its resolution depends the further destiny of Russia, the destiny of each of its citizens. That is why the president did not consider it possible to leave the appeal unanswered.

In it, the authors asked a whole number of questions. It does not seem possible to answer each one of them and Boris Yelstin dwells on the two which in his view are the most important.

Question one: Whether the authors intended it or not, their appeal is accompanied by some kind of sub-text claiming the signing of the new Union treaty casts doubt on Russia's sovereignty. No, and again, No! Boris Yeltsin declares. On the contrary, until the treaty is concluded Russia will remain a hostage of the central structures. Can one fail to notice how difficult it is today for each step to be taken on the road to acquiring genuine sovereignty?

Union departments will not hand over their functions to us voluntarily without the corresponding pressure of legislation. They will use any opportunity to preserve control over Russia's potential. If we adopt everything proposed by the authors of the appeal, then not only must the signing of the treaty be postponed, but more then this, work on it would virtually have to be started again from scratch. One simply could not find a better gift for the Union bureaucracy. As president of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin writes, I sense literally every day that the longer we live without a new treaty, the longer the diktat of the Union departments will continue. Once it is signed, we lose not a shred of the sovereignty we have already won. On the contrary, we acquire real rights in carrying out an independent domestic and foreign policy. To prove the above, Yeltsin cites an example from the field of the economy, saying that the Union treaty will make radical changes to the situation in this sphere. It will create conditions for all enterprises and organizations operating on the territory of the republic to come under the Russian flag, with the exception of those connected with the implementation of a limited number of functions which are delegated to the center. For its part, the treaty will make it possible to resolve what is perhaps the most important task, that of immediately granting our organizations and enterprises the right to choose for themselves the form of ownership and the conditions of management. This is already not just a case of real acquisition of statehood, it is the basis of further reforms, speedy, consistent, and uncompromising ones.

In his reply to the authors of the appeal, Boris Yeltsin says that once Russia has signed the Union treaty, the USSR president will issue a decree on transferring the whole economic potential of the RSFSR to the jurisdiction of our republic. At any rate, Mikhail Gorbachev has assured Yeltsin of this. It is obvious that there are those who will have doubts, expecting Gorbachev to suddenly be hindered from fulfilling his promise, and that then such a decree would be signed by the president of Russia. The new Union treaty makes such a step perfectly legitimate.

The second issue posed by the authors of the appeal concerns the Russian president's right to sign the new Union treaty. Boris Yeltsin assumes that the idea of those who signed the appeal boils down to this: that the draft treaty has never been debated by anyone in Russia, and so Yeltsin is arrogating a right that he has not been granted. The head of our republic considers that in this case, either people are misinformed, or they are distorting the real state of affairs. The draft new Union treaty was published, and every citizen of Russia was able to acquaint themself with it. Boris Yeltsin does not think this fact needs any proof, and emphasizes something else: The drafting of the treaty is the result of the efforts of a large number of Russian parliamentarians, and by no means the result of behind-the-scenes dealing by Yeltsin in Novo-Ogarevo, as one might infer from the appeal. The deputies examined this document on more than one occasion. In April, the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies adopted a special resolution on the draft Union treaty. In his reply, the president recalls one of the provisions of this resolution—to instruct the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, together with the commission of the second, extraordinary, congress for drafting proposals on the new Union treaty, to finalize the above draft resolution and the draft treaty on a union of sovereign republics, taking into account the proposals and amendments submitted by people's deputies at this congress, and to submit proposals on the procedure for signing of the Union treaty. More than two months was spent on implementing this congress decision, two months of fighting over literally every article and every line. Persistence and the search for a sensible compromise which did not cast doubt on the idea of sovereignty of Russia were what were at the basis of our strategy, the president writes. And that is why the result is legitimate.

In June of this year the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, having discussed the draft of the Union treaty and the results of the work on it by the Russian delegation, adopted the decision to acknowledge it as possible to sign the treaty on the Union of Sovereign States taking into account the amendments and addenda made by parliament. [as heard] Boris Yeltsin especially points out that the overwhelming number of them were adopted and were reflected in the final text of the treaty.

So can one today affirm that the text of the Union treaty is not known to anyone except the "Nine plus One," the president of Russia asks, reasonably? Is there really no meaning to the discussion and approval by the parliaments of all republics apart from the Ukraine which has scheduled examination of it for the beginning of September and has expressed a wish to join the new Union?

Boris Yeltsin ends his reply to the authors of the appeal with the following words: We, members of the state delegation of Russia, are approaching the signing of the new Union treaty convinced of the rightness of this step. I think that this is the most significant step in the past few years on the road to Russia's prosperity. Not to do it would be to deceive all Russians who are tired of waiting for change. I am not sure that the citizens of Russia will agree to tolerate our political disputes which do not make life any easier.

I remind you that this was a summary of the reply by Boris Yeltsin, the president of Russia, to the authors of an appeal to him, Comrades Afanasyev, Timofeyev, Batkina, Ivanov, Bortina, Bibler, and Bonner. The appeal was published in the 93rd number of NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA and the reply is in today's edition of the publication.

Yakut Supreme Soviet Nationalizes Union Property

LD1308142291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
1300 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] The Yakutian Supreme Soviet Presidium today issued a decree declaring state enterprises the property of the republic. In accordance with the document, all all-Union property on the territory of Yakutia is nationalized.

North Ossetia Extends State of Emergency

LD1308141191 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1215 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Vladikavkaz, 13 Aug (TASS)—Following petitioning from the suburban rayon soviet and the Vladikavkaz town soviet, the period of the state of emergency in the territory of the rayon and in the republic's capital has been extended to 19 September. This decision was reached today at a session of the

Supreme Soviet of the North Ossetia Soviet Socialist Republic in connection with the fact that the interethnic situation is still tense in the region.

A resolution was also adopted on the progress of implementation of the republican Council of Ministers' action program to stabilize the national economy and transfer to a market economy.

A statement by Sergey Khetagurov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of North Ossetia, and addressed by people's deputies stressed that the main concepts of this program are normalization of the socio-political situation in the republic and in the north Caucasus region, creation of new structural systems which can react flexibly to the financial and economic activity of the national economy, and control over the consumer market. Social issues under the conditions of the transfer to the market economy are given special attention in the republican government's program.

The deputies adopted a law on "privatization of the Housing Stock in the North Ossetia Soviet Socialist Republic," resolution "On the Plan for Measures Pronounced at the First Congress of Peoples of the North Ossetia Soviet Socialist Republic," and on the implementation of the republican law "on Public Associations."

Continuing Reportage on Departyization Decree

Gidaspov Comments

PM1308092991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Let's Try All Methods"]

[Text] A correspondent from the BBC asked Boris Gidaspov, leader of the Leningrad Communists and CPSU Central Committee secretary, what he thinks of the prospects for the Russian Communist Party and its place in today's society following the adoption by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President Boris Yeltsin of the famous decree on departyization.

Gidaspov stated: I believe that we represent the party which gave society glasnost, and the party which was first to proclaim the need to build a rule-of-law state; this party must be guided by the law. There is nothing wrong with this. It is simply that we must search expediently and peacefully for new forms of work. Incidentally, we have been concerned about this for a long time now, not just six months or a year. I would have been a real idiot if I had not seen as far back as a year ago how the development of events would progress. So we are trying all methods of work locally and in the production units.

Leningrad Begins Implementation

PM1308115491 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Aug 91 p 1

["Departyization" report by correspondent Yuriy Kukanov: "Tired of Begging for Dues"]

[Text] Leningrad—"So Yeltsin has finally cast off the fig leaf of democracy," Yuriy Belov, ideological secretary of Leningrad CPSU Obkom [oblast committee] and member of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, said with a sigh of relief, commenting on local television on the Russian president's decree on departyization. After giving a friendly warning to all other political parties and social organizations that the sad fate of the CPSU lies in store for them too, and after frightening the people, who are so ardently beloved by the Communists, with the threat of out-and-out poverty under total privatization, he grudgingly admitted that the decree must be fulfilled. "We are a law-abiding party!"—this prominent figure in the Russian Communist movement solemnly declared.

In itself, the intention by a political organization like the CPSU quietly to transform itself from a "lawfully solemnized party" into a "law-abiding party" is very gratifying. There is only one problem: Let us hope that this entirely remarkable metamorphosis does not prove to be no more than a play on words tailored to meet the needs of the current moment. Especially since an explanation followed: The party will act in accordance with its Statutes, which incorporate the production-territorial structural principle. The center of gravity in its activity will be shifted to the trade unions, women's councils, and other social organizations.

Yuriy Belov reminded us that this has happened before in history, when the party was forced to use the legal form of struggle. And now, in the pages of the newly emerged Russian Communist Party Central Committee newspaper NARODNAYA PRAVDA, Boris Gidaspov, first secretary of the CPSU obkom, talks in all seriousness about whether the CPSU is ready to operate... underground. It turns out, thank heavens, that it is not. And so, as the Leningrad Communists' leader stated at a meeting with Vasilyevskiy Island working people, Yeltsin's decree will have to be fulfilled. Whereupon, in his inimitable fashion, he promptly added: "Just imagine, one decree, another decree, a third, and then they will think up something else."

Meanwhile the Russian president's decree has already come into operation on the banks of the Neva. All cells and other structures of "Democratic Russia" are advised to cease all activity from 5 August at organs of state administration, soviet ispolkoms [executive committees], and state institutions, organizations, and enterprises. This decision was adopted by the Council of Representatives of the Saint Petersburg Regional Division of that movement.

Anatoliy Yefremov, general director of the "Vibrator" Association, has signed an order banning activities by all parties from 5 August. As the enterprise leader stated, the Communist Party and the Komsomol have played no part in the labor collective's life for more than a year now. The presidential decree is most of all to the liking of the association's party committee secretary, who, in Yefremov's view, has long since grown tired of begging for party dues.

Party Hits Splittist Activity, Urges Consolidation

PM1308103791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Aug 91 First Edition p 1

["Appeal From the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission to All Communists of the Russian Federation"]

[Text] Comrades!

The formation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party is taking place in difficult conditions. The RSFSR president's decree "On Ending the Activity of the Organizational Structures of Political Parties and Mass Social Movements in RSFSR State Organs, Institutions, and Organizations" is aimed at forcibly separating the party from labor collectives, which thereby are deprived of effective levers of organized influence on the socioeconomic policy of the state.

Allied to the RSFSR president's actions are attempts to weaken the party from within and disrupt its ranks. There are grounds for adding to the number of such attempts the founding conference of the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia [DPCR], which was held 2-3 August in Moscow and at which, out of the blue, the formation of the new party within the CPSU was announced. The conference approved statutes and elected a provisional party council. A congress at which it is proposed to adopt the party's programmatic documents, and also elect delegates to the Extraordinary 29th CPSU Congress, was projected for October-November 1991. The conference supported the RSFSR president's decree on ending the activity of organizational structures of political parties and social movements in RSFSR state organs, institutions, and organizations.

In connection with the above the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission considers it necessary to state the following:

Participants in the founding conference were not elected by Communists in accordance with the CPSU Statutes; some of them were not party members and, consequently, are not competent to adopt any decisions concerning the internal structure of the CPSU or the republic party organization.

The RSFSR Communist Party operates on the territory of our republic, having been formed a year ago on the wishes of Communists, and is a constituent part of the CPSU, guided in its work by the CPSU's programmatic documents and Statutes. Hence the proclamation of the DPCR (within the CPSU) blatantly contravenes one of the fundamental provisions contained in the (CPSU) Statutes on the unity of party organizations functioning on the given territory.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission supports the declaration by the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat recognizing the decisions of the DPCR's founding conference as legally invalid and having no force for the republic's Communists, and, consequently, as not liable to implementation in view of the fact that they contravene the Statutes.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission therefore considers unacceptable any participation by republic, kray, oblast, okrug, city, rayon, or primary organizations of the RSFSR Communist Party in forming the structures of the DPCR, or in financing measures objectively aimed at splitting the party.

Primary party organizations, party committees, and control commissions should analyze the activity of the various groups, currents, and platforms in every organization. They should objectively and impartially examine the views of the leaders and members of these organizations in a benevolent and comradely environment. While supporting in every possible way all constructive efforts to improve the situation, they should at the same time explain the harmfulness of factional battles within the party, which will in the end lead to a split in the party. If the need should arise, they should make a party-based assessment of persons provoking such a split.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission calls on all the republic's Communists to maintain their self-possession, to display great civil responsibility, and to continue creative constructive activity aimed at extricating society from the profound crisis it is undergoing. They should play an active part in the partywide discussion on the draft CPSU program and in preparation for the Extraordinary 29th CPSU Congress and the Second RSFSR Communist Party Congress.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission shares the conclusion of the July (1991) plenum of the CPSU Central Committee to the effect that we have a real opportunity on the basis of the new party program to consolidate the party as an influential political force expressing the socialist aspirations of the masses toward a society which guarantees an unwavering priority for the interests of the working people. Russia's Communists can and must occupy a worthy place in this constructive process!

Rutskoy Discusses Founding of New Party

PM1308145291 Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS in Portuguese 8 Aug 91 p 10

[Dmitriy Gaimakov (APN) report: "Gorbachev Wishes To Break With Dogmas"]

[Text] Yesterday, on the first weekend in August, the supporters of the Communists for Democracy tendency which has emerged within the Russian Communist Party, led by RSFSR Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, took a further step toward setting up the Democratic Party of the Communists of Russia [DPCR] in organizing in Moscow a conference to debate the problems inherent in founding the party.

Over two days representatives of the reformist tendency of the Russian Communist Party, which is dominated by the conservatives, discussed convening the first congress of the new party, which wishes to remain within the CPSU; outlined a program and rules; and elected their leadership bodies.

"We maintain that the party's political philosophy should be based not only on Marxism but also on other ideas which shape socialist and national thinking and that of the human and political sciences," Colonel Rutskoy told APN in an interview.

And he explained that the democratic tendency in the CPSU, despite "supporting the innovatory and democratic character of the new draft CPSU program," decided "to have a program of its own, which will specifically define our activities in Russia's interest."

"Significant on several counts," was how Rutskoy described the results of the the last CPSU Central Committee plenum, at which President Gorbachev's "social democratic variant" was approved, and its influence on the future actions of the "Communists upholding democratic values."

The discussion of the new CPSU program "revealed important and unexpected factors," Rutskoy stated. "We in the DPCR apply much more consistently the strategic line formulated by the 19th CPSU Conference in 1988 and by its 28th congress in 1990 than the artificially created Communist Party of Russia."

"If we did not convene our conference before the CPSU Central Committee plenum, it was because we decided to study in detail the party's new draft program and to draw our conclusions," Rutskoy said.

Support for Gorbachev

According to the RSFSR vice president, more than the new CPSU program, "the report presented to the plenum by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev leaves no doubts about his determination to break with ideological dogmas and obsolete stereotypes," and this leads the new party to support Gorbachev in his "intention to adjust the CPSU's world view and policy to the experience of development and the country's and people's urgent needs."

The CPSU draft program states that the old theoretical and practical model of socialism "has proved shaky," and that the CPSU will have to start "from the world socialist movement's experience and diversity," he said.

But in what can be viewed as an endorsement of the Soviet president, he stated that, in his party's opinion, "all the fundamental issues of perestroyka are put more clearly and honestly in the general secretary's report than in the CPSU draft program," and this makes it clear that "Gorbachev is facing up to continuing along the path of reforms."

"That is not the case with his comrades within the CPSU," Rutskoy said, drawing a clear distinction between Gorbachev and the party apparatus. "The plenum showed that the general secretary is surrounded by conservative ideologues at all levels of the hierarchy—from the oblast committee secretaries to the Central Committee apparatus and officials, not to mention the Russian Communist Party officials."

That is why "we founded the DPCR, which, while always acting within the CPSU, will be in opposition to the RSFSR Communist Party," he explained. "Our structures will be linked to the CPSU as long as we have faith in its ability to advance along the path of democratic reforms," he stated.

For its part, the Russian Communist Party, dominated by the conservatives and comprising around 10 million out of the 15 million Soviet Communists, is affiliated to the CPSU.

Parliamentary Party

Referring to the new party, the reformist colonel stressed that it is a political party which "has elected to its leadership bodies competent and disinterested people who champion cleaning up politics, support democratic relations within the party, and are opposed to the bureaucratization of its structures."

The DPCR, he stated, "will not take part in the public administration, and this will enable it to devote greater attention to theoretical matters and to carrying out political activity."

"We are trying to found a parliamentary party and do not refuse to work with people—our future voters," Rutskoy stated when defining the party's relations with society and the electorate. "We find inspiration in work, will make ourselves known through our opinions and activities, and will field our candidates for the state bodies."

Speaking of Boris Yeltsin's decree, which bans party activity in public institutions and within the Armed Forces and security forces, he stated that the DPCR "fully supports it," revealing that it is prepared to "observe the provisions" contained in the document.

Characterizing the DPCR's structure, he said that "we intend to set up our grassroots organizations in urban districts, cities, and constituencies," stating that "the new party's organization will have an organizational structure comprising several levels, from the cities, regions, and administrative territories through the republics."

Young People's Support

According to Rutskoy, they will perhaps form "associations based on branches of activity and professionals." In addition, "the congress will be the top body of the party," which at the same time intends "to set up an administrative council and a control commission, with equal powers," he revealed.

In conclusion, Rutskoy stated that they have "the massive support of young people," whose minimum entry age they have set at 16, "which will ensure continuity between the different generations of Communists."

Association of Self-Management Organs Set Up

PM1208104991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, POSTFAKTUM, AP, REUTER, INTERFAX, RIA roundup: "Moscow City Association of Organs of Self-Management Created"]

[Text] The founding conference of the Moscow City Association of Organs of Territorial Social Self-Management (STOS), which was attended by delegates from 110 soviets and self-management committees, adopted the association's charter and voted in favor of setting up an association council comprising 33 representatives of the "groups" ["kusty"] of rayon self-management councils. The association leaders were elected. Its president will be G. Zulumyan, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet Commission for the Work of Soviets and deputy in the Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon Soviet.

The founding treaty of the Moscow Association of Organs of Self-Management (MAS) was signed.

The association has been set up to provide aid to defend the rights of organs of self-management and assist their activities in solving neighborhood and citywide problems. The association will take an active part in forecasting the development of self-management, and in the elaboration and experimental verification of its new forms. The Coordination Council, which created the association, is continuing to operate but is already doing so under the authority of its elected leaders.

Russian Compatriots' Congress Opens 19 Aug

OW1408044691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A congress of compatriots opening in Moscow on August 19 will be attended by about 1000 delegates from Russian communities abroad, the chairman of the congress's Executive Committee Mikhail Tolstoy has told a news conference in Moscow.

Among the delegates will be historian Aleksandr Nekrich, human right activist Kronid Liubarskiy, publicist Lev Kopelev, Julian Panich and others.

Tolstoy said that the aim of the congress would be to foster the confidence of Russians abroad in the current reforms in Russia.

Tolstoz said the organisers believe that the delegates to the congress must meet any two of the thee requirements—the knowledge of Russian, the intention to be involved in Russia's life today, and a Rusian background. Tolstoy said that Russia was a reference to the RSFSR in its current borders.

The opening of the congress is going to be attended by the President of the Russian Republic Boris Yeltsin. On August 24, the delegates will be received by Moscow's Mayor Gavriil Popov. The program of the congress includes 21 scientific and thee business round table discussions with the participation of representatives from the parliament and government of Russia, experts from the USSR academy of Sciences and Russian businessmen. The congress will be held in Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Perm, and Novosibirsk. There will be extensive religious and cultural programs.

Plan for Siberian Republic Causes Controversy

LD1308092191 Moscow TASS in English 0657 GMT 13 Aug 91

["Polemics Erupt Over Plans To Declare Siberian Republic"—by TASS correspondent Viktor Yelmakov]

[Text] Novosibirsk August 13 TASS—A Siberian newspaper has published a controversial plan to proclaim a Siberian Soviet Federal Republic with a capital in Novosibirsk, which immediately came under fire from the Russian leadership.

The plan, carried by Tomsk-based NARODNAYA TRIBUNA (PEOPLE'S TRIBUNE), provides for the new republic to unite 19 Siberian regions.

The idea prompted a sharply negative response from Russian leaders, including Vice-President Ruslan Khasbulatov [title as received], who decried it as "separatist". Prime Minister Ivan Silayev also rejected the plan in a televised appearance.

A member of the federal parliament from Tomsk, in contrast, thinks the idea is not at all too bad, though not timely, because, he told a Novosibirsk-based paper, right now it plays into the hands of conservative forces.

Speaking in an interview with SIBIRSKAYA GAZETA (SIBERIAN GAZETTE), Stepan Sulakshin added, however, that one or several Siberian republics may come into being later—but not earlier than five or ten years from now, when democratic forces come to power.

He accused the Siberian nomenklatura, or Communist Party and economic establishment, of "dangerous maneuvring" in connection with its launch of a "Siberian Agreement" association a year ago.

Sulakshin contended that the bureaucracy formed the association, comprising 17 local regions, "to wrest Siberia from the Russian Republic and the legal control of President Boris Yeltsin".

Association chairman Vitaliy Mukha, however, disagrees. "The 'Siberian Agreement' is not an administrative entity and, contrary to some ironic critics, does not have anything to do with the idea of a 'Siberian khanate'," he told the SIBERIAN GAZETTE.

When visiting here one and a half months ago, Yeltsin supported the "Siberian Agreement's" economic programmes. He issued an edict to grant broader rights to the association, including the possibility to market 25 percent of locally produced raw materials as it sees fit.

Both the very idea of a Siberian republic and the polemics over it reflect local people's discontent with the fact that for many years their land has been reduced to the role of a raw materials supplier for the country, enjoying virtually a colonial status.

The idea of establishing a Siberian republic was first suggested publicly a year ago by some Siberian leaders during the "Siberian Agreement" founding convention, which, however, did not support the plan then.

Local reporters are now trying to identify the authors of the latest plan published in the Tomsk newspaper.

Belorussia

Report Notes Scandal Over Business Deal

LD1308035691

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 2000 GMT on 12 August, in its "Vesti" newscast, carries a two-minute item by reporter Maysenya about the recent scandal caused in Minsk by the KOMMERSANT weekly disclosures about the $3 billion in credits allegedly promised to the Belorussian Council of Ministers by an Italian citizen, (Guiseppe Curzi), on behalf of a group of European banks.

(Curzi) was declared a bogus figure much like the well-known Coppola, who attempted to discredit Boris Yeltsin's government. However, the facts as reported by KOMMERSANT have not been confirmed. One speculation about who is to benefit from such accusations connects this case with the forthcoming presidential election campaign in Belorussia. The idea appears to be to discredit Vyacheslav Kebich, one of the most likely candidates for the presidential post. The rumormongers may have achieved some of their aims, but the Italian businessmen who are offended by the KOMMERSANT reports are taking the matter to international court in The Hague.

Manpower Shortage Cited for Agriculture Decline

PM0908151491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Mikhail Shimanskiy from Minsk: "Belorussian Countryside's Concern"]

[Text] The situation in the republic's economy is extremely complex and is continuing to deteriorate. So said M. Myasnikovich, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, at a Council of Ministers session devoted to the results of work in the national economy in the first half-year.

Concern and anxiety is prompted first and foremost by the situation in agriculture. Experts believe that this year the republic will harvest approximately 1 million tonnes less grain than last year. So how many million tonnes will have to be purchased—where from, and what with?

Manpower in livestock raising is an acute problem. Even in Grodno Oblast, where until recently stockmen used to come from various regions of the country to gain experience, today some kolkhozes and sovkhozes are forced to sell cows. There is no one to milk them. More housing and social and cultural facilities must be built, to try to keep young people in the countryside. And built quickly, otherwise in a few years' time the countryside will be left without manpower, as happened in the Nonchernozem. And then it will be impossible to rectify the situation. But what funds can be used for building, when the lion's share is taken up by the elimination of the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster?

In short, extremely alarming trends have taken shape in Belorussia's agricultural production. If they persist, in the near future agriculture here will fall back to the 1988 level. And that is in a republic traditionally famed for its highly developed meat and milk production and for growing excellent potatoes.

Deputy Minister on Harvest Progress, Problems

PM1308160191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Aug 91 Union Edition p 1

[M. Shimanskiy report: "There Are More Problems than Grain. What is Hindering the Harvest in Belorussia"]

[Excerpt] Minsk—[passage omitted] Today many people still recall the waiting lines for bread in the city stores last spring. And now it is clear by the state of the crops that there will be a shortage of grain. So it is important to prevent losses. This is not easy.

"In the Belorussian grain fields—and this year they occupy almost 2.6 million hectares—heavy rain 'lodged' the grain when it was ripening in many places, particularly in Brest, Gomel, and Minsk Oblasts. On the other hand light soils were affected by drought," A. Starovoytov, Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] deputy minister of agriculture, explained. "But on the whole the harvest started in a well-organized way, and 4 to 5 percent of the crops sown are threshed every day. The difficulties are truly unbelievable. After all, it is not just in Belorussia but in the whole country that the system of material and technical provision for the countryside has virtually collapsed. The old ties have been broken and new ones are not in place yet. But nevertheless we have managed to achieve the almost impossible: Around 29,000 combines, including 7,000 'Dons' were made ready for the harvest. The average workload per combine is 89 hectares—this in itself is a guarantee that we will carry out the harvest quickly."

According to operational data, by 8 August around 40 percent of the area had been harvested in the republic. Farms have started selling grain to the state. The grain growers intend to fulfill the state order, which is 1,200,000 tonnes.

"Nevertheless I would like to remind you again of the very bad provision for the harvest," A. Starovoytov said in conclusion. "Look: 320 'Don-1500' combines are standing idle without cutting tables. Trucks have been sent to Kharkov, Odessa, and Kursk to collect combine batteries—here the situation is also critical. Almost all plants, disregarding USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply orders, have reduced the supply of spare parts for vehicles. Hundreds of pick-up balers are standing idle—there is no binding twine to bale the straw.... This is what I think: If we want there to always be bread on our tables, then the whole country, everyone together, should do something about it."

Ukraine

Fokin: Famine Could Possibly Be 'Equal to' 1933

LD1308220191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 13 Aug 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Ukrainian Prime Minister Fokin, returning from a conference in Moscow, has stated that not a single republic will be able to provide itself with food products or even grain this year. The Ukraine is threatened with a famine equal to the tragedy of 1933, the (?EUROPE-FORUM AGENCY) reports.

Collective Farm Chief Sends Telegram to Fokin

LD1208221991 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 12 Aug 91

[Text] Ivan Repa, chairman of the Frunze collective farm in Zhitomir Oblast, sent a telegram to Fokin, prime minister of the Ukraine. It says:

Esteemed Vitold Pavlovich, I watched your appearance on television under the call state granaries of the Ukraine must be full of grain, and fell into desperation over the state of grain procurements. As collective arm chairman I am far from satisfied with what is being done for the countryside. There are too many words and too few deeds.

But all this is, so to say, a preamble. The main thing I'd like to express is anger and contempt for the leaders of all ranks who groundlessly ignore the state's orders for grain deliveries. I look into their eyes and say firmly: You are blind and accidental people.

Vitold Pavlovich, the people will not forgive you if you fail to display strong will and remove the thick-heads from the road. If not today, then tomorrow the people will understand your rigid but lawful actions and lend its support. You have very little time at your disposal in order to obtain grain in necessary quantities.

Our farm has already gathered grain from (?40) percent of the allocated areas. We have fulfilled our delivery plan and intend to sell twice more. I propose to republican papers to print the lists of those readers who impudently sabotage the sale of grain to the state. And what is the state? It is children, relatives, next-of-kin. And the lists should be printed under the headline: Attention, here are those who bring closer the day of new famine plague [holodomor] for the Ukrainian people. I beg you to publish this telegram in newspapers.

Plyushch Views Republic Economic Policy

LD0908220291 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1900 GMT 8 Aug 91

[Excerpt] Ivan Plyushch, first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, met today with a delegation of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We hand the microphone over to Serhiy Hubin.

[Hubin] Ivan Plyushch said that up until now the Soviet economy has not succeeded in getting rid of ideological influence. In turn, it is slowing down the process of establishing market structures, making the painful transition period toward free enterprise more difficult.

The center, they say, only rubs salt into this painful wound of ours. By every possible means it is trying to keep the main economic levers in its hands. This applies, in particular, to the credits and investments policy, which is formed, as before, by Union ministries. Ukraine is trying to demonopolize this policy.

This presentation of the question evoked interest on the part of visiting Western bankers, and at the same time it frightened them. Among them were financiers from Germany, Italy, Finland, Japan, and the United States. In the past all credits for the Soviet Union were granted under the availability of corresponding guarantees.

The arguments advanced by the Ukraine, judging by the atmosphere, satisfied the guests. Ivan Plyushch assured them that our republic does not intend to break up the Union. The main thing for the Ukraine is to achieve state-like self-determination. [passage omitted]

Republic Cabinet Bans Exports of More Goods

OW1408012691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1420 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers has made additions to the list of goods forbidden to take out of the republic. The additions include butter, sugar, all kinds of alcoholic beverages and tobacco.

Previously the list included some electric goods, building materials, and such foodstuffs as meat, tinned meat and milk products, flour, cereals, pasta, sunflower oil and cheese.

At the same time, the cabinet has lifted its former restrictions on the export of bread, margarine, eggs, sweets, tea and coffee, since the new rationing system introduced in the Ukraine on August 1 does not allow visitors to the republic to buy a quantity of any of these products to a sum exceeding one ruble.

The Cabinet has also decided to allow the export of foodstuffs and other goods in accordance with a special quota or on a license. The cost of each license is 150 rubles.

Whenever violations of the restrictions are discovered, the confiscated goods will be put on sale in local shops, to be sold at state prices.

Resolution on Foreign Travel Takes Effect

LD1108132791 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0000 GMT 11 Aug 91

[Text] As of today, 10th August, the resolution of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Cabinet of Ministers on temporary additional measures to regulate citizens' exit to foreign countries and protection of the republic's consumer market has become valid.

The resolution limits the number of foreign travels by the republic's citizens, that is, two trips per year. Either as a tourist or a private visitor, the traveller will have to pay 1,000 rubles [R] for the first trip abroad and R2,000 for the second one. The sum doubles for every next trip. The money thus raised will be channelled to the extra budgetary funds of the work of Soviets of People's Deputies.

The resolution has the temporary validity and will be terminated after all the checkpoints on the borderline will be properly agreed, so that the customs officers were [as heard] able to keep control over the luggage of the travellers. The resolution is supposed to protect the consumer market in the republic because the majority of travellers withdraw large quantities of commodities and foodstuffs for business transactions abroad.

New Independent TV Station in Republic Reported

PM1408152191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 11 Aug 91

[From the "Television News Service" newscast: Report by P. Savchak and A. Shubin]

[Text] [Savchak] It looks like state television is getting some serious competition. The independent TV studio "Ukrainskiy Chas" [Ukrainian Hour] has started operations in the city of Stryy, Lvov Oblast. It is registered with the local soviet of people's deputies and broadcasts for around four hours daily starting from 2100. Viewers can see repeats of the programs in the morning. To be able to watch "Ukrainskiy Chas" the residents of Stryy and adjacent villages need only pay a fee of 100 rubles [R] and an additional monthly subscription of R10. They can tune in to local news, religious programs, films about the leaders of the national spiritual revival, videos, advertising, and entertainment programs.

Republic KGB Documents on Stalin Era Released

LD0908175491 Moscow TASS in English 1149 GMT 9 Aug 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev August 9 TASS—The Ukrainian KGB has handed archive documents from its file on Levi-Itskhak Shneerson, the late chief rabbi of the Ukrainian city of Dnepropetrovsk who was framed up and executed by Stalin's secret police in 1939, to representatives of the international Lyubavichi Movement.

The documents include minutes of interrogations, an original letter by shneerson to Lavrentiy Beria, chief of Stalin's secret police NKVD—the forerunner of the KGB, recordings of court proceedings, and others.

"The transfer of these materials to us is a real embodiment of new thinking and good will," Professor Berl Levinson, chief archivist of the Lyubavichi Rabbinate, told TASS. He said this now made it possible to perform the religious duty of perpetuating Shneerson's memory.

General Georgiy Kovtun, one of the Ukrainian KGB chiefs, said that work to rehabilitate one million people illegally prosecuted in the republic in different years would continue. Although belatedly, justice has already been restored towards some 400,000 such victims of Stalin's repressive policies.

During their meeting with Lyubavichi Movement representatives, KGB officials agreed to immediately begin looking for material on other leaders of the movement in the Ukraine, who were repressed during the 1930s.

Moldova

Leader Denies Gagauz Harboring 'Terrorists'

PM1308101991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Aug 91 First Edition p 3

[Letter from S. Topal, chairman of Gagauz Republic Supreme Soviet, under "Recent Mailbag" rubric; no date given: "Gagauzes Are a Peaceful People"]

[Text] Esteemed editors, in connection with the situation which has arisen I ask you to publish the following letter in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

The central mass media, in particular Central Television's Television News Service program, have disseminated the announcement of N. Kirtoake, director of the Moldovan Government's State Department for Military Questions, to the effect that the Moldovan Republic's national army would be utilized to combat "terrorists" from the Dnestr and Gagauz Republics.

The Gagauz Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium declares with complete responsibility that there are no armed formations on the territory of the Gagauz Republic, and no terrorists groups have been recorded.

The Gagauz people are engaged in peaceful, constructive labor, and its lawfully elected government is engaged in forming republic structures of power and administration.

In announcing this bogus threat, the Moldovan Government is seeking to legalize anticonstitutional armed formations and to justify in the eyes of the public their use against the people of the Gagauz Republic. We reject blackmail and threats. Expressing the will of the people, the Gagauz Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium is prepared to come to the negotiating table to discuss all disputed issues.

At the same time the Gagauz Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium warns that full responsibility for the negative consequences of the actions of illegal armed formations on the territory of the Gagauz Republic and for increasing tension and destabilizing the situation in the region will lie with the Parliament and Government of the Moldovan Republic.

S. Topal, chairman of the Gagauz Republic Supreme Soviet

Komrat

Law Establishing National Bank Comes Into Force

LD1308175291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1146 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Kishinev, 13 Aug (TASS)—The law "On the National Bank of the Republic" has come into force in Moldova. The tasks of this financial body are "to draw up a common state policy of the Republic of Moldova in the field of monetary circulation, to administer the monetary and credit system, and where necessary to guarantee the stability of the currency of Moldova in relation to foreign currencies".

The MOLDOVA-PRESS agency reports that the company capital of the republic's National Bank amounts to 300 million rubles. However, the bank's management believe that good conditions have been established for replenishing the reserve capital, contributions to which will account for 10 percent of the total annual profit. National Bank President Leonid Talmach considers it perfectly possible for the Bank to cooperate with commercial banks already existing in the republic and with foreign investors, for whom a special branch conducting operations in hard currency will be set up.

Customs Posts Introduced To Protect Consumers

PM1308135091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Aug 91 Second Edition p 1

["Topical Theme" report by A. Pasechnik: "Will the Customs Posts Help?"]

[Text] Kishinev—More than 20 customs posts are being set up on the roads joining Moldova with the neighboring Ukraine. This forced measure by the Moldova Government could be viewed as another attempt to protect the republic's consumer market. The last attempt—the introduction of ration coupons—proved ineffective. Will the customs posts help?

The local press published a list of goods which in the event of their being exported from the republic will be subject to an increased customs duty rate. Thus, if a tourist buys more than a kilogram of butter or cheese as a souvenir, he will be required at the customs check to pay for the surplus at double the original price. Top position on the "scale" being used is held by cognac. Every bottle exported in excess of the stipulated two will cost the connoisseur nine times more. Therefore, it is more worthwhile now for a tourist to take a drink on the spot than at home. As for televisions and refrigerators, the rate of payment will be four times the original price. The same applies to photographic equipment, clocks and watches, and irons.

Will this help to fill the empty shelves in the republic stores? As the saying goes—God only knows. It is comforting to know that the local government, which adopted a resolution on additional measures for improving the supply of consumer goods to the republic population a few days ago, understands that the main problem lies elsewhere. In the fact, for example, that contracts for delivering and producing these goods cover less than one half of the demand in the republic market. Production of these goods in Moldova in the period January-May declined by over half a million rubles compared to the same period last year, while the sale of various groups of goods to the population fell by 15-30 percent.

An extraordinary government Commission on the Problems of Regulating the Consumer Market was set up by the said resolution. The ministries, departments, and local soviets are instructed to adopt urgent measures for increasing output and the delivery of goods to the people, and their leaders have been warned of their personal liability in this matter.

Anyway, the medicines for the pain, as it is called, are familiar from former times. Their efficacy is also well known. No comment is needed here. But you know, not only have times changed, but circumstances have changed, too. The extreme imbalance in intereconomic links and the fall in the level of labor discipline and responsibility are intensified by the Moldova leadership's special position regarding the Union treaty and by the recently adopted decision on establishing republic jurisdiction over Union industrial enterprises.

Economics and politics in the republic are being wound into an ever tighter knot. It is hardly possible to cut it. It could be unraveled. Although this will require massive efforts.

Georgia

Asatiani Discusses Ossetia, Ties with RSFSR

OW1408013391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Chairman of the Georgian Parliament Akakiy Asatiani has told IF [INTERFAX] that the Georgian leaders have normal relations with the leaders of Adzharia and working ties with those of Abkhazia. He said he was satisfied with the fact that Abkhaz officials "were beginning to work on the positive and constructive basis".

Asatiani said that in the near future South Ossetia will receive new structures of government at the city and district level. Asatiani said that a stop to bloodshed in South Ossetia was Georgia's main achievement so far.

About Georgia's relations with Russia Asatiani said that "there was an opportunity for establishing friendly relations, which would ultimately become fraternal." He pointed out that for Georgia relations with Russia were of strategic importance.

Statistics Indicate Continuing Economic Recession

OW1408034191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1420 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to the economic and information committee of the Supreme Council of Georgia, the economic recession in the republic which began in 1986 is deteriorating.

There has been no improvement in the first half of this year. The gross national income has been 16.7 per cent lower than that for the same period in the last year. Productivity has dwindled by 15.9 per cent.

More on Republic's Economic Woes

LD1408085691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0800 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Text] The Georgian Parliament's Committee for Social and Economic Information has published an analysis of the state of the economy in the first half of this year. In the republic today there is no sphere of economic activity not gripped by crisis. Compared with the same period last year, the national income produced decreased by 16.7 percent. Social labor productivity dropped by almost 16 percent. Over the last six months, the destruction of economic links and the distortion of important economic proportions has continued, investment has noticeably decreased, and the credit-finance system has been disrupted.

Agreement on Exchanges With Tatarstan Signed

OW1408005991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1420 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In this year, Georgia is going to receive large quantities of oil, 300 heavy KAMAZ lorries, rubber goods, construction bitumen, and much else, the leader of a Georgian delegation, Murman Omonidze, has told journalists in Kazan. All these deliveries are stipulated by an agreement recently signed by the two republics.

Georgia is to be Tatarstan's partner in the latter's economic contacts with foreign countries, and allow Tatarstan to use its unique resorts on the Black Sea.

As the first step in the implementation of the programme, Tatarstan will establish contacts with the oil industry of South Africa through the mediation of Georgia's Foreign Ministry.

Armenia

Premier on Possible Post-Referendum Developments

NC1308113191 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1950 GMT 12 Aug 91

[Text] Vazgen Manukyan, chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers, gave a news conference today at the Armenian Supreme Soviet. In his statement, the prime minister noted that 16 August marks his first year in office and therefore an overall assessment of the period is in order. But, he added, he will make this assessment while replying to questions from reporters.

In opening the news conference, he first referred to the republican referendum and the Union treaty, issues which are crucial for our republic and our people. The referendum is one of the important steps on the road of independence, which is linked to the Union treaty, the premier said, and added: There is no doubt that our people will say yes at the referendum, since this involves the honor of the nation. What awaits us after the referendum? The prime minister mentioned a few variants.

The first variant, which is improbable, is that after a yes vote at the referendum the Soviet Union will throw us out and erect barriers before us. In which case we will end up with a collapsed economy, will fall into a grave situation, but would over the years rise up on our feet.

The second variant, which also is improbable, is that we could gradually, without conflicts and in a civilized manner, detach ourselves from the Soviet Union.

The third variant, which is probable, is that we will not be ousted from the structure of the Soviet Union and no barriers will be erected against us, but military and economic pressures will be applied on us.

The fourth variant is that we will continue to stay as we are and will advance by adapting to the situation and attain independence gradually.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers also referred to the Union treaty and to the mistakes committed during the Nagorno-Karabakh movement.

Next, the prime minister replied to questions from reporters.

TASS Reports Manukyan's Comments

LD1308130391 Moscow Tass International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Text] Yerevan, 13 Aug (TASS)—There would be a point to signing the Union treaty if it provided a procedure for withdrawal from the Union, Armenian Council of Ministers Chairman Vazgen Manukyan thinks. Speaking at a news conference in Yerevan, he at the same time admitted the possibility of Armenia participating in the Union treaty, for example, as an associate member—in order, according to him, "while not rejecting the course of independence, not to subject itself to strong blows."

V. Manukyan stressed that all the republics have an interest in preserving a unified economic area. He said that some economic results can be achieved by conducting an active policy with the republics, and he announced the forthcoming signing of an economic agreement between Armenia and the Russian Federation, and about attempts to conclude economic accords with the republics of Central Asia.

Speaking about the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, the Council of Ministers chairman declared that there is sense in negotiations "if backed up by strength," and that "during negotiations it is very important how many guns you have behind you." In his opinion, even if some sort of agreement is reached, in a year or two Armenian villages in Karabakh will be evacuated again. Nevertheless, negotiations should continue, V. Manukyan is convinced.

Further on Interrepublic Contacts

OW1408003891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a press-conference on Monday, Armenian Prime Minister, Vazgen Manukyan, acknowledged that as Armenia was paving her way to independence it needed allies. He also added that Armenia should reckon on the assistance of the Union republics, not of foreign countries. Economic contacts should be maintained with both the republics which intend to sign the Union treaty and those which have not yet expressed their wish to do so, he noted.

Mr. Manukyan said that in August Armenia and the Russian Federation were expected to sign a treaty on economic cooperation for 1992. There are plans to conclude similar treaties with the Central Asian republics.

Speaking about the goals of the Armenian National Democratic Union which is being organized on his initiative, Mr. Manukyan said that this organization was expected to unite the democratic forces of the republic. He said that Armenia's all-national movement in which he participated, had failed to do so through the fault of certain leaders who had sought uncontrollable power thus turning that movement into a substitute for the Communist Party.

The Armenian Prime Miniser said that the Armenian National Democratic Union would gather for its first meeting on August 15.

Manukyan Announces Candidacy for President

OW1408003191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1420 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Armenian Prime Minister, Vazgen Manukyan, is going to stand for president of the republic. As he said at a press conference in Yerevan yesterday, he will give his official consent after August 16, when candidates are officially nominated.

He said the referendum on the republic's secession from the Soviet Union to be held on September 21 was a step on the republic's way to independence rather than an end in itself.

As for the Union treaty, Armenia could only sign it, Manukyan said, if it contained strict provisions for secession from the new Union, which it does not.

Republic Communists Back Talks on Union Treaty

OW1308232391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "The leaders of the Armenian Communist Party believe that the policies of the republic's current leadership are disastrous", the party's leader Aram Sargisyan has told IF [INTERFAX]. In his view Yerevan's reluctance to take part in the discussion of the treaty of the union is adventurist and politically immature.

"I am quite certain that the treaty of the union is worth discussing and signing, because in the current situation Armenia will be able to have an independent policy on the condition it remains in the political and economic system of the new confederation. [quotation mark as received]

Sargisyan believes that it is not too late to join the discussion of the treaty of the union, make proposals and, if some articles of the treaty of the union disagree with the interests of the Armenian people, the treaty of the union can be signed in principle.

Republic's Communist Party Formally Registered

OW1408034391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1420 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Communist Party of Armenia has been formally registered in Yerevan today.

At the moment, the Armenian Communists are preparing for the republican referendum. They believe Armenia should sign the Union treaty.

In spite of the government measures to remove Communist Party cells from government bodies and state-owned enterprises taken a few months ago, the party is stepping up its struggle for influence on the masses, and today has a membership of 130,000, which is a lot more than it had at the beginning of the year.

Internal Ministry Troops Captured in NKAO Town

LD1408115491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0957 GMT 14 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert, 14 Aug (TASS)—Worrying events are developing around the Armenian village of Aterk in the Mardakertskiy Rayon of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. At 1330 yesterday, an army patrol detained Zh. Petrosyan, an inhabitant of Aterk, near the village. He was carrying an automatic weapon and ammunition.

The office of the commandant for the state of emergency region in the NKAO and the neighboring rayons of the Azerbaijan Republic told a TASS correspondent that within 30 minutes an APC was surrounded in the village and 12 servicemen of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs forces were captured. Some time later another 21 servicemen were also seized there.

According to the report of the commandant of the Mardakertskiy Rayon, the leader of the so-called self-defense unit of Aterk this morning demanded that in exchange Petrosyan, as well as four inhabitants of the village who were detained earlier, be released.

The Mardakertskiy Rayon executive committee told the TASS correspondent that, according to its information, none of the captured servicemen has been harmed and no violence has been inflicted upon them.

Talks on the release of the hostages started at 1000 today between representatives of the commandant's office of the state of emergency region and leaders of the armed grouping.

At the same time, a gathering took place in the village of Aterk at which the elders demanded that the leaders of the armed grouping release the servicemen without conditions of any kind.

According to information received from competent sources, at 1030 V. Sarkisyan, a representative of the republican defense council flew from Yerevan to Aterk to settle the conflict.

Major General Vladimir Starikov, deputy chief of staff of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs internal troops, has commented on the alarming news from Stepanakert, saying: "When they were captured, the servicemen did not offer any resistance. They showed humanity, realizing that the villagers—old men, women and children—would suffer first and foremost. It was the elders of Aterk, demanding that the fighters release the soldiers, who were the first to comprehend this. After all, amongst those taken hostage were soldiers who were undertaking the most peaceful and noble action—escorting a food convoy.

"What took place in Mardakertskiy Rayon cannot be described as anything other than lawlessness. The sooner the conflict is settled peacefully, the better for both sides."

Azerbaijan

President Mutalibov To Visit Iran 'This Week'

LD1408083891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0800 GMT 14 Aug 91

[Text] NOVOSTI reports that Azerbaijan President Ayaz Mutalibov will pay a visit to the neighboring Islamic Republic of Iran at the end of this week. The four-day visit will take place at the invitation of the Iranian leadership. It is expected that documents aimed at the intensive development of good-neighborly relations and mutually beneficial economic and cultural cooperation will be signed during the visit.

Baku Muslims' Meeting on Prospects for Religion

LD1308191191 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku August 13 TASS—A gathering of akhunds of all mosques of Azerbaijan and Georgia was held here today to discuss the draft law on the freedom of conscience and religious organizations in the USSR.

Speaking at the gathering, chairman of the Caucasian Muslim spiritual department Sheikh Pasha-Zade noted that for the first time ever a genuine democratic code of laws of religious life can be created in the country.

Its democratism is based primarily on the fact that the draft was prepared with the participation of church representatives, the sheikh said.

Conditions for free profession of religion have been created over the past three or four years in Azerbaijan, stated heads of Muslim communities.

Mosques are being repaired with money donated by believers. There were only 18 mosques two years ago, and now there are over 50 of them. An Islam institute and a religious school were opened in Baku.

The Bibi-Eibat mosque in Baku, one of the sacred places of the Orient that was blown up back in the 1930s under the authorities' decision, will be restored with voluntary donations. The construction will require 12 million roubles.

At the same time, speakers at the gathering noted that mosques should be given back the lands alienated as a result of church separation from the state during the first years of Soviet power in Azerbaijan.

Unfortunately, nothing is said about this in the draft law, community heads pointed out.

Kyrgyzstan

Republic Expands Foreign Economic Activity

LD1308093191 Moscow TASS in English 0846 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Bishkek August 13 TASS—The first batch of tomato paste made by the agricultural enterprise Yntymak, Kyrgyzstan, was dispatched to Europe on Tuesday.

The plant, equipped by the Italian firm Manzini Camaco, is the first processing enterprise in the republic to exports its products.

The plant can process about 200 tonnes of vegetables and fruits daily. It has launched the production of various types of seasoning, tomato juice and vinegar, and plans to make canned fruits, apple and apricot jams. Half of them will be exported to Europe, the other part will be sold in Kyrgyzstan.

The laws on banks and foreign investments recently adopted in the republic have opened up great possibilities for foreign investors. The republic has already signed agreements with China. The South Korean Goldstar [company] has begun making colour TV sets and microwaves in Kyrgyzstan. The Turkish Pramota firm is equipping several light-industry plants. The republic has signed a protocol on intention with the Chilean company Biotron International.

Turkmenistan

Niyazov Says Republic Will Sign Union Treaty

LD1408090791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0808 GMT 14 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent N. Chunakova]

[Text] Ashkhabad, 14 Aug (TASS)—"Turkmenistan will sign the Union treaty," Saparmurat Niyazov, president of Turkmenistan stated at a press conference in Dushanbe (Soviet Tajikistan). He was in the fraternal republic on a visit (12-13 August).

The Turkmenistan Supreme Soviet session, which took place in Ashkhabad, approved the draft of the Union treaty in principle, and instructed the president to sign it, after some clauses had been given concrete expression. This concerns, in particular, those points in which the clauses on taxes is interpreted loosely. The deputies of the Supreme Soviet of Turkmenia, in discussing the draft treaty, noted that this document meets the interests of the republic and proceeds from the logic of the declaration of sovereignty which was declared. The deputies approved the treaty with the same unanimity with which the Turkmen people spoke out in its favor in the March referendum.

Uzbekistan

Central Asian Leaders Meet in Tashkent 13 Aug

LD1308142791 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 13 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Pruyer and Lev Levin]

[Text] Tashkent August 13 TASS—Presidents of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenia and Uzbekistan met here today to discuss problems of the vast and most densely populated Soviet area of the Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

They will also sum up the fulfillment of agreements reached at the first meeting of "the sort held in the Kazakh capital of Alma-Ata in July 1990."

The first meeting saw representatives of the sovereign republics signing joint documents on interaction in politics, the economy, science, culture, ecology, education and social sphere.

The current meeting is expected to include the discussion of the new Union treaty that will be opened for signing on August 20.

Judging by the results of last March's referendum on the future of the USSR, the absolute majority of local residents favour the preservation of the union. The need to conclude the Union treaty was beyond doubt here as well.

A standing committee on the coordination of social and economic development of republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan is expected to be set up.

The Azerbaijan prime minister attends the meeting as an observer.

Further on Tashkent Meetingt

OW1408000891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 13 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Presidents of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Turkmenia have arrived in Tashkent to discuss of the treaty of the union and the situation in Central Asia. The conference will be attended by a delegation from Azerbaijan under Prime Minister Gasan Azizogly Gasanov in the capacity of observer.

Upon his arrival in Tashkent the President of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev said that the time has come for all republics going to sign the treaty of the union to stop to think what will happen afterwards and whether fundamental changes capable of ending the crisis in the economy will begin." [quotation mark as received]

The President of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov said that in the first place the leaders of Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan must formulate a common position in the run-up to the conclusion of the treaty of the union. In his view, the treaty guarantees the sovereignty and legal and juridical status of each republic.

The conference opening on Wednesday will look into progress in implementing the agreements achieved at the first meeting of the leaders of Central Asian republics that took place in Alma-Ata in June last year.